THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

HER PRINCIPLES, MINISTRY AND SACRAMENTS.

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 03906 5891

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

Her Principles, Ministry, and Sacraments.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM ODOM,

VICAR OF HEELEY, SHEFFIELD,

Author of "Gospel Types and Shadows of the Old Testament," &c.

THIRD THOUSAND, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith."

London:

JAMES NISBET & Co., 21, BERNERS STREET.

SHEFFIELD: THOMAS WIDDISON, 14, FARGATE.

1891.

JUN 2 1 1994

First Edition, 1883.

Second Edition, 1885.

Third Edition, 1891.

[ORIGINAL DEDICATION.]

TO

The Most Reverend Wm. Thomson, D.D.,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,

THIS BOOK IS

(WITH HIS GRACE'S KIND PERMISSION)

Respectfully Dedicated

BY HIS

FAITHFUL SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

PROTESTANT CHURCHMEN'S UNION AND TRACT SOCIETY

OBJECTS: To afford a basis of union, and opportunities for consultation and concertea action, for all Churchmen who desire to uphold the principles of the Reformation, and to maintain the non-sacerdotal character of the ministry of the Church of England. To circulate distinctively Protestant and Evangelical Church literature—tracts, etc., free of charge; larger publications at special prices. Lists on application. Subscriptions and Donations urgently needed, and earnestly solicited.

JAMES B. RYAN, Hon. Lay Secretary and Treasurer. Office, 20 Bay St., Toronto, Canada.

THE APOSTLES' CREED.

I BELIEVE IN GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH:

AND IN JESUS CHRIST HIS ONLY SON OUR LORD, WHO WAS CONCEIVED BY THE HOLY GHOST, BORN OF THE VIRGIN MARY, SUFFERED UNDER PONTIUS PILATE, WAS CRUCIFIED, DEAD, AND BURIED, HE DESCENDED INTO HELL; THE THIRD DAY HE ROSE AGAIN FROM THE DEAD, HE ASCENDED INTO HEAVEN, AND SITTETH AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD THE FATHER ALMIGHTY; FROM THENCE HE SHALL COME TO JUDGE THE QUICK AND THE DEAD.

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST; THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH; THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS; THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS; THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING. AMEN.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—Preface	vii
II.—Introductory Chapter	1
III.—The Holy Catholic Church	22
IV.—The Church of England	34
V.—The Christian Ministry	51
VI.—The Sacraments	71
VII.—The Sacrament of Baptism	78
VIII.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper	94
IX.—Confession and Absolution	116
X.—Prayer for the Dead	130
XI.—Church and State	136
XII.—The Book of Common Prayer	148
XIII.—Church Work and Progress	166
XIV.—Roman Catholicism and Nonconformity	174
XV.—Concluding Chapter	186

Chronological Table. General Index.

THE Church's one foundation
Is JESUS CHRIST her LORD;
She is His new creation
By water and the Word:
From heaven He came and sought her
To be His holy Bride,
With His own Blood He bought her,
And for her life He died.

Elect from every nation,
Yet one o'er all the earth,
Her charter of salvation
One LORD, one Faith, one Birth;
One Holy Name she blesses,
Partakes one Holy Food,
And to one hope she presses
With every grace endued.

Though with a scornful wonder
Men see her sore opprest,
By schisms rent asunder,
By heresies distrest,
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
Their cry goes up, "How long?"
And soon the night of weeping
Shall be the morn of song.

Mid toil and tribulation,
And tumult of her war,
She waits the consummation
Of peace for evermore;
Till with the vision glorious
Her longing eyes are blest,
And the great Church victorious
Shall be the Church at rest.

PREFACE.

"IT IS QUITE CERTAIN THAT WE, WHETHER MINISTERS OR PEOPLE, CLERGY OR LAITY, CAN ONLY DO GOD'S WORK IN THIS CHURCH OF ENGLAND BY ADHERING FIRMLY AND CONSISTENTLY TO THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR CHURCH, AS LAID DOWN AT THE GLORIOUS AND BLESSED EPOCH OF THE REFORMATION."—*Dean Hook.*

This Work—intended as a comprehensive hand-book to the principles and doctrines of the Church of England—has been written with a special view to the present critical times. We have been careful to give at considerable length the authoritative teaching of the Church of England as set forth in the Prayer-Book (A.D. 1662); the Thirty-nine Articles (A.D. 1562); and the Homilies (A.D. 1562). The statements of Roman Catholic teaching are from the recognised standards of the Romish Church. Extracts are given from the Directories, Manuals, and other Works used and commended by the Ritualistic party. Special care has been taken to indicate the source

of the quotations. In nearly every instance the quotation is first-hand.

In considering the various subjects, it has been impossible to steer clear of controversy, and, notwithstanding the aversion of many persons to controversy, we are convinced that the present condition of things within the Church demands it. We much regret the cause for it, but feel assured that if conducted in the right spirit, controversy tends to the removal of error and the firmer establishment of truth. "Ring out the false: ring in the true." Our Lord and His Apostles preached the truth; they also exposed and condemned error. By virtue of our Ordination vows we of the Clergy are pledged, not only to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments of Christ, but also, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word."

So far as space would allow we have endeavoured to give the teaching of the Church of England on many important matters which are now stirring the minds of Churchmen and others; and have sought to establish the Evangelical and Protestant principles of our Church by the testimony of some of her greatest scholars and divines.

Amongst those quoted may be named:—Archbishops Leighton, Usher, Longley, Tait, Thomson, and Whately; Bishops Beveridge, Burnet, Blomfield, Cosin, Jewel, Stillingfleet, Jeremy Taylor, Browne, Lightfoot, Fraser, Ryle, and Christopher Wordsworth; Deans Alford, Burgon, Goode, Goulburn, Hook, Howson, Perowne, and Vaughan; Canons Barry, Farrar, Robertson, and

Westcott; Dr. Isaac Barrow, Richard Hooker, Geo. Stanley Faber, Dr. Waterland, Dr. Whitaker, Archdeacon Hare, and E. H. Bickersteth.

As to the passages adduced in confirmation or illustration of the various subjects, we would adopt the words of a thoughtful and well-known writer of our Church, the late Geo. Stanley Faber, who in his sermons (vol. i. p. 332) says:—"As Protestants indeed we claim to call no man *master* save Christ alone; nor do we hold ourselves *bound* by the authority of eminent divines one jot further than as the opinion which they advocate *may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ.*'

October, 1883.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

I AM thankful to be assured that an attempt to provide for Churchmen a Manual which should not only seek to expose and disprove erroneous teaching, but also, with some fulness, indicate and assert the principles of the Church of England, has been cordially approved by a wide circle of readers.

It was no matter for surprise that pages dealing with many debateable matters should clash with the cherished opinions of some persons. On the one hand, the *Church Times*, in a lengthy and courteous review, admits that the work is "written with a sincere desire to be fair," but naturally objects to what is said concerning the sacerdotal character of the Ministry, Auricular Confession, Prayer for the Dead, etc. On the other side, I am condemned because I "cling to the unscriptural practice of Infant Baptism," and am content to be "bound with the golden fetters" of an Established Church. It could not, of course, be expected that ultra-Ritualists and Liberationists would approve everything said on these points.

It is admittedly true that a large proportion of Churchmen

are exceedingly ignorant of the history, doctrines, and constitution of their Church. There is, unhappily, what Archbishop Whately called "a kind of indolence which leads to an excess of undoubting confidence. To prove all things, and hold fast that which is right, is too troublesome a task for many, who are accordingly contented to adopt a whole system of doctrines and sentiments in the mass, to maintain it dogmatically, and refuse to hear anything that can be urged on the other side." Oliver Goldsmith once said to Boswell:—"As I take my shoes from the shoemaker, and my coat from the tailor, so I take my religion from the priest." It is to be feared that many persons still act in this loose way. This same principle obtains in matters both political and religious. Not a few refuse to think for themselves, and are not unlike one who resolves to regulate his time by a certain watch, without inquiring whether the watch is right or not.

Controversy in religious matters seems to be an inevitable condition of the preservation of truth. Some persons tell us it is folly to expend strength in confuting Rationalism or proving Romanism to be false—that we had "better leave all these negations alone, and seek to live them down by the positive holding forth of the Word of Life." Fair-sounding words, but impracticable nevertheless, as all who know the history of the Church of Christ must admit. The goodly fellowship of the Prophets, the glorious company of the Apostles, and the noble army of Martyrs were controversialists. Error in all its manifold forms, and not seldom in the guise of truth, is abroad and active. Archbishop Whately truly says that "Ignorance is the soil on which errors are most likely to spring up." It is needful,

then, as far as possible, that the useless and dangerous weeds of error should be uprooted. "Contend earnestly for the faith—the *deposit of sound doctrine*—once for all delivered to the saints" is the Apostolic precept. "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word?" is the searching question to which every clergyman gives an affirmative reply at ordination. Bishop Wordsworth, in his Commentary on Jude, says: "St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John had written with a *twofold* design; first to establish the truth, secondly to refute error." We claim the right to follow Apostolic practice in this respect. Silence gives currency to error, complicity with which will disable us from making any successful protest against it.

There are, unhappily, in the Church of England those who are not only ashamed of the term "Protestant," but who also seek to throw contempt upon it. But as a writer in the *Quarterly Review* (vol. 69)—probably the late Professor Sewell—says, "It is our glory and our happiness to be Christians; our safeguard and consolation to be Catholics; our sad and melancholy duty—a duty which we can never abandon till Rome has ceased to work among us—to be Protestants."

Bishop Hervey has observed that "the object of controversy should be to clear away all prejudice, all ignorance, all passion, every groundless opinion and prepossession, which stand in the way of truth." It is with this aim that the following pages have been written. But they will be found to have a *positive* as well as a negative side, and, so far as the plan of the work would allow, the great principles of the Church of England, as propounded at the Reformation and embodied in the

Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles, have been re-stated and re-affirmed.

A widely circulated work of reference (1891) says of Evangelical Churchmen, "They think comparatively little of the historical position of the Church, and of Church authority in matters of doctrine and discipline, and of her rites and sacraments." It is evident that no one fairly acquainted with the facts would have made a statement so unjust and misleading.

In these days of active enquiry it is essential that every member of our Church should have such a knowledge of Church principles as will enable intelligent answers to be given to such questions, as:—Why are you a Churchman? What are your distinctive doctrines? What is the nature of the sacraments? What are the advantages of your form of Church government? What are the differences between Churchmen and Roman Catholics? What are the distinctions between Churchmen and Nonconformists? What is your Church doing for the good of mankind? It is hoped that the chapters which follow will assist in furnishing material for such answers.

I now venture upon the difficult and somewhat delicate task of naming some books which will be of service to ecclesiastical students. It is needful to say that this must be looked upon as a *general recommendation*, and not as an expression of *entire approval.* The following may be regarded as *modern elementary* books, suitable for readers whose time is limited, and who desire to have a fair statement of facts.

Lane.—Notes on English Church History. Vol. i., From Earliest Times to the Reformation; ii., The Reformation and Modern Work. (1s. each, S.P.C.K.)

The British Reformers; from Wycliffe to Foxe. (3s., R.T.S.)

Canon Robertson.—Sketches of Church History, from the First Century to the Reformation. (2s., S.P.C.K.)

Becket.—English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. (3s. 6d., R.T.S.)

Dr. Lindsay.—The Reformation. (2s., T. and T. Clark.)

The following volumes of the "Theological Educator" Manuals:—*Jennings*—Church History, 2 vols.; *Principal H. C. G. Moule*—Outlines of Christian Doctrine; *Hole*—Book of Common Prayer. (2s. 6d. each, Hodder and Stoughton).

Dr. Maclear—Catechism of the Church of England; Introduction to the Creeds; *Procter and Maclear* on the Prayer Book. (2s. 6d. each, Macmillan).

Dr. R. P. Blakeney.—Handbook of the Liturgy. (1s. 6d., London.)

Canon Daniel on the Prayer Book. (10d., National Society.)

Bishop Barry.—Teachers' Prayer Book. (3s. 6d., Eyre and Spottiswoode.)

Bishop Oxenden.—The Earnest Churchman. (2s. 6d.)

Canon Jenkins.—Romanism: The Creed of Pius IV. (5s., R.T.S.)

Dr. Littledale.—Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome. (1s. 6d., S.P.C.K.)

Canon Overton.—The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century. (2s. 6d., Longmans.)

Bishop Perowne.—Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. (1s., Nisbet.)

Canon Meyrick on the Holy Communion. (2s. 6d., Longmans.)

Dr. Freeman.—Disestablishment and Disendowment. (2s., Macmillan.)

Englishman's Brief for his National Church. (1s., S.P.C.K.)

I now indicate, for the guidance of those who may desire to look further into the subjects treated of in the following pages, some leading authorities on the History, Government, Ritual, and Doctrines of the English Church:—

I.—CHURCH HISTORY.—*Canon Robertson's* History of the Christian Church. (A.D. 54—1517); *Bishop Stubbs'* edition of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History; *Soames'* History of the Anglo-Saxon Church; *The Venerable Bede's* Ecclesiastical History; *Dr. Thomas Fuller's*

Church History of Britain to 1648; *Bishop Burnet's* History of the Reformation; *Bishop Lightfoot's* Leaders in the Northern Church; *Dr. Bright's* Chapters of Early English Church History; *Murray's* Students' English Church History; *Hore's* History of the Church of England; *Dean Hook's* Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury; *Dr. Boultbee's* History of the Church of England (*Pre-Reformation period*); *Dr. Wordsworth's* Ecclesiastical Biography; *Dr. Stoughton's* History of Religion in England, from 1640; *Dean Milman's* History of Latin Christianity; *Dr. Geikie's* English Reformation; *Bishop Ryle's* Christian Leaders of the Last Century; *Abbey and Overton's* English Church in the Eighteenth Century; *English Diocesan Histories* (S.P.C.K.); *John Foxe's* Book of Martyrs. (Dr. Wordsworth, above named, says of this: "It never has been proved, and never will be proved, that John Foxe is not one of the most faithful and authentic of all historians"). *Dr. William Smith's* Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities, and Christian Biography and Doctrines. First eight centuries. (*Very learned and full, but costly.*) *Dean Hook's* Church Dictionary.

II.—The Prayer Book.—*C. Wheatly*—Book of Common Prayer (*first published* 1726). *F. Procter*—History of the Book of Common Prayer (*a standard work*). *Dr. Blakeney*—The Prayer Book: its history and interpretation (*exhaustive and valuable; written from a Protestant standpoint*). *J. H. Blunt*—Annotated Prayer Book (*a scholarly work, favouring the views of advanced Ritualism*). *Canon Daniel*—The Prayer Book: its History, Language, and Contents. *W. G. Humphrey*—Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer.

III.—The Articles and Collects.—*Thos. Rogers* on the Thirty-nine Articles (*first published* 1607). *Bishop Beveridge* on the Thirty-nine Articles. *Bishop Harold Browne*—Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. *Dr. Boultbee*—Theology of the Church of England—Thirty-nine Articles. *Dean Goulburn*—The Collects of the Day.

IV.—The Creeds.—*Bishop Pearson*—Exposition of the Creed. *Dr. Barrow* on the Creed. *Bishop Westcott*—The Historic Faith. *Bishop Harvey Goodwin*—Foundations of the Creed.

V.—Ecclesiastical Polity and Church Doctrine generally. —*Hooker's* Ecclesiastical Polity. *Dean Field*—Of the Church.

Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church. *Bishop Jewel*—Apology for the Church of England. *Dr. Barrow* on the Pope's Supremacy; and the Unity of the Church. *Bishop Jeremy Taylor*—Dissuasive from Popery; and the Real and Spiritual Presence. *Dr. Waterland*—Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity. *Dean Goode*—Divine Rule of Faith and Practice; and Effects of Infant Baptism. *Dr. Mozley*—On the Baptismal Controversy. *Archbishop Whately*—Kingdom of Christ *Bishop Ryle*—Principles for Churchmen. *Dean McNeile*—The Church and the Churches. *Dean Vaughan*—Liturgy and Worship of the Church of England. *Dr. Hatch's* Bampton Lectures (1880) on the Organisation of the Early Christian Churches. *Dean Lefroy*—The Christian Ministry. *Dr. Salmon*—The Infallibility of the Church. *Canon Curteis's* Bampton Lectures on Dissent in relation to the Church of England. *Earl Selborne*—Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment, and Ancient Facts and Fictions concerning Churches and Tithes. The Homilies and Canons, together with the writings of *Latimer*, *Ridley*, *Cranmer*, and other Reformers, should also be referred to. Those who desire information concerning the Church of England and its work, its chief Officers, its various Home and Foreign Missions, its many Diocesan and other Institutions, Church and School building, Education, Endowments, Charities, etc., will find the same, as far as it can be tabulated and summarised, in the *Official Year Book of the Church of England.* (S.P.C.K.)—An invaluable comment by a master mind, on Church questions and Church controversies from 1840 to 1872, will be found in the *Charges* of the late Bishop Connop Thirlwall (1877, 2 vols.), edited by Dr. Perowne, now Bishop of Worcester.

The second edition of this work, published in 1885, was enlarged by the insertion of chapters on Church and State, and the Prayer Book. In the present edition, chapters have been added on Church Work and Progress, and Roman Catholicism and Nonconformity; the chapter on the Church of England has been re-written, and other

portions carefully revised. The utmost care has been taken with regard to the authorities quoted.

I now send forth this new edition, which has been prepared amid the constant calls of a large town parish, with the earnest prayer that the Great Head of the Church may be pleased to make it useful in the cause of truth. If it should stimulate to further inquiry into the foundation principles of the Church of England, I shall be amply rewarded. Whilst we prefer the strivings for truth to the quiet of apathy, and to a hollow unsatisfying uniformity, let us seek to walk by the Apostolic rule :—"Following after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." My closing words shall be those of the learned and good Bishop Thirlwall :—"Truth, we know, is great and will prevail. With this belief let us comfort our hearts. To this let us firmly cling amidst the surgings of doubt and controversy, while we lift up our eyes to the Father of Lights, 'with whom' alone 'is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,' beseeching Him to enlighten us with His truth, according to the measure of our need, but above all to grant to us the higher grace of walking faithfully by the light we have received."

> "Hail to the State of England ! and conjoin
> With this a salutation as devout,
> Made to the spiritual fabric of her Church :
> Founded in Truth ; by blood of Martyrdom
> Cemented ; by the hands of Wisdom reared
> In beauty of holiness ; with ordered pomp,
> Decent and unreproved. The voice that greets
> The majesty of both shall pray for both ;
> That, mutually protected and sustained,
> They may endure as long as sea surrounds
> This favoured Land, or sunshine warms her soil."

Sheffield, September, 1891.

Introductory Chapter.

"Contend earnestly for the Faith."

WE live in a restless age, at a time when Infidelity is bold and aggressive, and Indifference to true religion sadly prevalent. The Church of England is passing through perilous times! On the one hand she has to contend against Rationalism and Infidelity; on the other, she is distressed by the stealthy but certain advance of Ritualism, or, as Dean Burgon styles it, "the plausible counterfeit of Romanism proper."

Not only are attempts being made to banish Religion and the Bible from our Schools and Colleges, and to erase the name of God from the statute-book of our land, but men are claiming the right to blaspheme the Almighty, and to hold up to ridicule the Revelation which He has given us.

In ancient Rome some hundreds of gods were set up in the Pantheon. These the people worshipped, each person selecting his favourite deity. Gibbon, in his history, states that "the various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher as equally false; and by the magistrate as equally useful." It is to be feared that a similar disposition is not uncommon now in Christian England. Amongst the people there is not that discrimination in matters of religion which there ought to be. Many learned men are Agnostics; they put aside the Bible and hold that nothing is known of God or the future. Not a few statesmen and magistrates, supported by a section of Nonconformists,

are seeking to sever Religion from the State on the ground that in the government of a nation religion should not be recognised. It was formerly held that Christianity was part of the law of our realm, and that the laws of England were founded on the Word of God, which Word was declared to be "the secret of England's greatness." But now, in the name and under the plea of liberty, not only are direct attacks on the Bible and Christianity tolerated, but they are even admitted to be lawful. The Lord Chief Justice of England, in a recent trial for blasphemy, said to the jury—"You have heard with truth, that these things are, according to the old law, or the *dicta* of the old judges, undoubtedly blasphemous libels, because they asperse the truth of Christianity. But, for reasons I will explain presently, I think that these expressions can no longer be taken to be a true statement of the law of the present day. *It is no longer true, in the sense in which it was so when these dicta were uttered, that Christianity is part of the law of the land.*"

That a judicial statement such as this should be made in Christian England is one of the sad signs of the times. We are confident that—as with the individual, so with the State—if it become godless, its condition will soon be hopeless. "The nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish."

This spirit of unbelief and indifference is, then, one of the great evils against which the Church of England has to contend.

There is, however, another danger which disturbs her peace, impedes her work, and threatens her very existence; one not from without, but from within. There is a departure from the faith, a forsaking of the old paths. The words of St. Paul to the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx. 30)—words true of the Church of every age—are at the present crisis specially applicable to our Church:—"From among your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them."

It is admittedly true that ceremonies and doctrines clearly opposed to Apostolic order and Evangelical teaching, distinctly repudiated by the Church of England—and against which the Reformers protested with their life-blood—are now openly practised and taught in many of our churches;

whilst the Reformers themselves are maligned and referred to as "political adventurers," "a set of miscreants," "men whose characters will hardly bear investigation."*

Within the last few years the Ecclesiastical Law Courts of England have pronounced no fewer than *sixty* ceremonies, vestments, and ornaments, sought to be introduced by Ritualists, to be illegal and contrary to the doctrine and usages of the Church of England. This newly-revived ritual comprised such ornaments and ceremonies as the placing of a figure of the Infant Saviour over the credence table at Christmas; the suspension of a stuffed dove over the Communion Table on Whitsunday; the erection of a crucifix several feet high near the pulpit; the using of incense; the mixing of water with wine, and the substitution of wafers for bread, at the Holy Communion; the blessing of palms; the blessing and elevation of candles; the blessing of ashes, and rubbing of the same on the foreheads of some present; processions with crucifix on a pole; unauthorised vestments; bowing to the crucifix; ceremonially washing and wiping the communion cup, etc., etc.

Men are claiming to be sacrificing priests, and, to use their own words, undertake to offer on their altars "the most holy sacrifice which the Lord Jesus offered on the cross."

Since the Romeward movement commenced vast numbers of clergy and laity have left the Church of England for that

---

* The character and work of the Reformers need no defence at our hands. History clearly proves to all unbiassed minds that the Reformation was an inestimable blessing to our land, both in its civil and religious aspects. We give the late Archbishop Whately's opinion of these noble men, and his witness is true:—"I know not how anyone can escape the imputation of very low notions of morality, who continues to retain his position in our Church, and speaks with bitterness of those not in communion with it, while he opposes the principles, and even vilifies the character of our Reformers. To me it does appear that—without attributing to those Reformers an infallibility which they expressly disclaim—we may justly give them credit for such sound views, and such resolute adherence to evangelical truth, combined with such moderation and discretion, as were—considering the difficult circumstances they were placed in—truly wonderful; and such as are in all times, and not least in the present, well worthy of imitation . . . . Their 'Faith' they drew from the Scriptures; their 'Hope' they based on the Scriptures; their 'Charity' they learned from the Scriptures."—*Kingdom of Christ Delineated*, pp. 220, 221.

of Rome. If it were possible to obtain a full list of those who, prepared by Ritualistic teaching, have gone over to the Church of Rome, the result would be startling, and would, we think, assist in rousing the great body of English laity from their present apparent indifference.

In a charge to the clergy of London, by the late Bishop Blomfield, delivered in 1850, is the following noteworthy passage: "I am unwilling to condemn, without reserve, the motives of those amongst the clergy who have thought themselves at liberty to imitate, as nearly as it is possible to imitate without a positive infringement of the letter of the law, the forms and ceremonies of the Church of Rome; or to insinuate, without openly asserting, some of the most dangerous of those errors which our own reformed Church has renounced and condemned." After speaking of the zeal of such clergy, and allowing that they might have acted thus for the sake of retaining persons of "warm imaginations and weak judgments" in our Church, the Bishop proceeds:—"If such has been their object they have been grievously disappointed. Concession to error can never really serve the cause of truth. If some few have been thus retained within the pale of our Church, many others have been gradually trained for secession from it. A taste has been excited in them for forms and observances, which has stimulated without satisfying their appetite, or they have naturally sought for its fuller gratification in the Church of Rome. They have been led step by step to the very edge of the precipice, and then, to the surprise and disappointment of their guides, have fallen over."—*Charge*, pp. 48, 49.

Such were the words of a High Church bishop more than thirty years ago, and such have been and are the effects of that tractarian teaching which he deplored, and which taught men to believe that the Church of England was separated from that of Rome by a faint and almost imperceptible line. During the past thirty years facts confirmatory of Bishop Blomfield's statement have accumulated to a surprising extent.

Dr. Manning (Roman Catholic Archbishop) says: "In the last thirty years there has sprung up in the Anglican establishment an extensive rejection of Protestantism, and a sincere desire and claim to be Catholic. . . . At this

time the doctrine of the Sacraments, their nature, number and grace; the intercession and invocation of saints; the power of the priesthood in sacrifice and absolution, etc., are all held and taught by clergymen of the Church of England. Add to this the practice of confession—and the latest and strangest phenomenon of the movement—the adoption of an elaborate ritual, with its vestments, borrowed from the Catholic Church."—*Essays on Religion*, s. 2, p. 12.

The Weekly Register (Roman Catholic) of January 1st, 1871, has the following paragraph: "The number of converts in London alone has been upwards of two thousand during the past year. From every Ritualistic congregation in London there is a continual stream of converts drifting towards us, and the number would be increased had we priests sufficient to look after those who are hesitating. Out of every twenty Anglicans who have joined the Church, not less than seventeen have been prepared for the step by the teaching they have received from Ritualistic pulpits, and by the practices they have got accustomed to in Ritualistic churches." The *Tablet* (Roman Catholic) recently declared that "the Ritualists are doing our work, and doing it in a manner in which we cannot do it ourselves." John Keble, writing to Bishop Wilberforce, said, referring to Dr. Pusey, "A larger number, possibly, has seceded to Rome under his special teaching than from that of any other individual now amongst us." Bishop Wilberforce himself wrote to Dr. Pusey thus: "I firmly believe the influence of your personal ministry does more than the labours of an open enemy to wean from the pure faith and simple ritual of our Church the affections of many amongst her children. . . . You seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman confessor, and not that of an English clergyman."

A great number of our bishops, in language more or less vigorous, have distinctly designated Ritualism as a "Romeward movement." *Dr. Ollivant*, late Bishop of Llandaff, said in Convocation (1866), "I cannot but consider this a Romeward movement, and a very rapid movement." *Dr. Thirlwall*, late Bishop of St. David's, said:—"Nothing, in my judgment, can be more mischievous, as well as in more

direct contradiction to notorious facts, than to deny, or ignore, the Romeward movement." *Dr. Wilberforce*, late Bishop of Winchester, in a speech delivered in the House of Lords (1873), said:—"I hate and abhor the attempt to Romanise the Church of England." *Dr. Tait*, late Archbishop of Canterbury, addressing his archdeacons and clergy (1871), said:—"No one can take up a newspaper or travel in a railway carriage, without being confronted with the fact that the laity of England are alarmed by seeing that there are some of the clergy who are bent on restoring the Mass, and the distinctively Roman doctrines which this country rejected at the Reformation." The same prelate, in Convocation (1877), said:—"The Ritualists are engaged in what I am obliged to call a conspiracy in our body against the doctrine, discipline, and practice, of our reformed Church." *Dr. Magee*, Bishop of Peterborough, speaking of the Ritualistic party (1873), said:—"No one can deny—the most advanced members of the party do not themselves care to deny—that it is, in its latest development, marked by a close, and even servile imitation of all the minutest details of Roman Catholic ceremonial; a hankering after Romish theology, and Romish forms of private devotion; an almost childish affectation of all the most Romish modes of thought and forms of expression." *Archbishop Tait* and *Archbishop Thomson* in reply to a memorial, presented to them in 1873, signed by 60,000 lay Churchmen, directing attention to the Romish character of the Ritualistic movement, wrote:—"There can be no doubt that the danger you apprehend of a considerable minority, both of the clergy and laity amongst us, desiring to subvert the principles of the Reformation is real . . . . We feel justified in appealing to all reasonable men to consider whether the very existence of our national institutions for the maintenance of religion is not imperilled by the evils of which you complain."

Many other powerful testimonies might be adduced to show the tendencies of Ritualism, but the foregoing will suffice to prove that most determined attempts are being made, not to lead to the Church of Rome, but to Romanise the Church of England.

This then is the present position of our Church: assailed

by a bold and aggressive infidelity from without, and harassed by disloyal and unfaithful members within.

Should any one think disloyal too strong a word, let him turn to the Ritualistic press. It has been observed that there are "Christian" papers which *mis*represent Christianity, and we may safely affirm that there are "Church" papers which grossly misrepresent the Church. Who, for example, could think it possible for a passage like the following to appear in a paper professing to be a Church of England journal? The writer, after supposing the case of a priest appointed to the charge of a Protestant parish, recommended the following plan as the first step towards the "restoration of Catholic worship." "A room, either in the parsonage or some other easily accessible place, might be arranged as an ideal sanctuary. It should have an altar of proper form, correctly vested, and furnished with lights and crucifix; behind it should be some kind of carved or painted re-table, such as was common in 1548-9. The room should be furnished with images—allowed even by the Privy Council to be lawful, if not abused to superstitious uses—and sacred pictures. Near the altar should hang the censer, and on the credence table the numerous etcetera which are included by the term of the Ornaments Rubric, should be placed. On three tailor's dummies should be arranged—(1) "vestment" and alb (the vestment, of course, technically implies stole and maniple); (2) tunicle and alb; (3) surplice and cope. The Ornaments Rubric, written out large, should be hung in a conspicuous place in the room, and photographs of Catholic altars and interiors should hang on the walls. This room should be thus retained *en permanence* till its contents could be transferred to the Church. Into this room the parish priest should take, a class or two at a time, the Sunday scholars, allow them to inspect closely its contents, explaining to them the meaning of every 'ornament,' and never forgetting to impress on them: 'These are the ornaments which the Church of England sanctions; they have fallen out of use through the prevalence of carelessness and unbelief; they are now being restored in many places, and, by God's grace, will some day be restored to your own parish Church.' In the same manner he should take the communicants (a few at a time),

the confirmation candidates, and any inquirers he may come across."—*Church Review.*

The Ritualistic journals, in advocating pre-Reformation practices, defend the Confessional and Prayers for the Dead, and urge upon the clergy to aim in public worship at what is called the "Six Points" standard, viz.: (1) The Eastward Position. (2) Mixed Chalice. (3) Wafer Bread. (4) Altar Lights. (5) Eucharistic Vestments. (6) Incense. They plead for the use of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., which retained the word "altar"; contained addresses to the Virgin Mary; ordered the use of wafer bread, and the mixing of water with the wine; included Prayers for the Dead; permitted Auricular Confession; prescribed the use of Sacrificial Vestments; and referred to the Lord's Supper as the Mass.*

The same papers not only take every opportunity of deriding the term "Protestant," and speaking disparagingly of those who approve evening communion, but also constantly justify the action of those clergy who disregard the monitions of their bishops, and treat with contempt the decisions of the law courts. Notwithstanding that they deem the theory of apostolical succession to be essential to the Church's existence, these same papers have spoken of not a few of our bishops in terms of studied insult and contempt which editors of the secular press would scorn to use, and which have caused the hearts of devout Churchmen to burn with shame.† Can it be wondered that the infidel papers should carefully reproduce such irreligious statements for the gratification of their godless readers? The Rev. R. T. Davidson (now Bishop of Rochester) at the Church Congress in 1881,

* The Archbishop of Canterbury's Lambeth Judgment in the Lincoln Case (1890), ruling that two lighted candles, the singing of the *Agnus Dei*, and the Mixed Cup, are permissible in the Communion Service (because not prohibited in the Prayer-book) is contrary to the decisions of the Queen's Privy Council, and of the Court of Arches, and is regarded by many as showing "a desire to conciliate the Romanising party within our pale."

† The *Quarterly Review* for January, 1869 (p. 134), after giving some specimens of ultra-Ritualistic literature, says:—"Objectionable as these works appear to us in many ways, the worst of them give but little idea of the vulgarity and scurrility, the venomous malice and unscrupulous falsehood of the newspapers of this party." It is a matter for deep regret that the reviewer's words are still applicable.

said:—"In a few almost consecutive numbers of the *Secular Review* I find sixteen direct references to the *Church Times* as the typical exponent of what our English Christianity is."

A further proof of disloyalty to the Church is the fact that many of the extreme Ritualists are agitating for Disestablishment. At a meeting of the English Church Union, held in London in November, 1870, under the presidency of the Hon. C. L. Wood, the Rev. A. Stanton (St. Alban's, Holborn) said:—"Nothing is so fatal to us as this Establishment, and if by the blessing of Almighty God the suspension of Mr. Mackonochie overturns that rook's nest so much the better." In a publication entitled a "Kalendar of the English Church" for 1883, appears the following:—"CHURCH LEAGUE FOR THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE. *President:* The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie, M.A. The object of the Church League is to promote the Disestablishment of the Church of England on the basis of the two following resolutions, passed at a meeting of clergy, held in London on January 23rd, 1877: —(1) 'That it is desirable to form a body, hereafter to be named, for the object of promoting the freedom of the Church in spiritual matters from State control.' (2) 'That the only way of effecting this object under existing circumstances, is by the separation of Church and State.'"

Additional evidence of disloyalty to the principles and doctrines of the Church of England may be found in various "Directories," "Manuals," and other Ritualistic publications. Several of these are before us as we write. Four—intended for the clergy—may be specially noted, inasmuch as they all contain a large amount of teaching altogether opposed to that of our Reformed Church, and virtually identical with that of the Church of Rome:—

(1) "*The Directorium Anglicanum; a Manual of Directions for the right Celebration of Holy Communion, etc., according to the ancient use of the Church of England.*" *Second Edition. Edited by the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L.* Some quotations from this Directory will be found on succeeding pages. The *Guardian* in its review of this work says: "There is no portion perhaps of this Directory that will be more strange to the majority of English readers than the

'Cautels of the Mass'; that is, the cautions and directions to be observed by the celebrant of Holy Communion. In the volume before us they appear in what we fear we must call their superstitious completeness in an English form. When we are told that 'if the Eucharist hath fallen to the ground, the place where it lay must be scraped, and fire kindled thereon, and the ashes reserved by the altar,' etc., we feel that what was intended for reverence has become not merely superstitious, but irreverent also."

(2) *The Priest's Prayer Book* (5th edition, 12th thousand) contains a variety of offices, including prayers in putting on the Stole, Hood, etc., Benedictions of Candles, Incense, Tapers, Crucifix, Cross, Banner, etc. The following is an example—"Bless, we beseech Thee, this taper: pour upon it Thy heavenly blessing." There are also offices for the Anointing of the Sick; Prayers for the Departed; directions for making Holy Water, and notes on Confession. Examples of the teaching of this book are given on subsequent pages.

(3) *Kalendar of the English Church*, published yearly, contains "Ritual Notes," in which the Lord's Supper is referred to as the Mass. Elaborate directions are given for incensing the "Priests," the "Altar," and the "Service Books"; the kissing of the "Altar" and books; the bearing of tapers and lighting of candles; the fixing of crucifixes and crosses, etc.

(4) *The Order of Divine Service*, published annually, advises that "there should be a cross on each altar, sufficiently large to be seen, not only by the priest who celebrates, but by the people who assist at the Holy Sacrifice. It will be more in conformity with ancient practice if it have upon it a figure of our Lord."

Thus the Book of Common Prayer is supplemented, if not supplanted, by manuals unauthorised and unsound, and this by men solemnly pledged to use in the services of the Church the Book of Common Prayer, "*and none other*, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority" (see p. 61). With teaching such as that just indicated within the Church, what wonder is it that there should be unbelief without? Infidelity and scepticism are the natural results of priestly teaching and superstitious ceremonial.

The present condition of France and Spain bears witness to this. M. Renan, the noted French writer, who exchanged ecclesiastical infallibility for hopeless scepticism, is one example out of many of the effect of a superstitious religion upon a thoughtful mind.

Space will not permit us to do more than name the numerous Manuals and Books of Devotion written chiefly for the laity, such as "Pardon through the Precious Blood, or the Benefit of Absolution" (by a committee of clergy, 55th thousand, 1891), widely circulated amongst the newly confirmed; "Treasury of Devotion" (edited by Canon Carter); the "English Catholic's Vade Mecum"; the "Altar Manual" (edited by a committee of clergy); the "Communicants' Manual"; the "Little Prayer Book" (revised by three priests); and "The Congregation in Church" (23rd thousand, 1891). The Rev. Orby Shipley, a compiler of books of this class, has joined the Church of Rome, and doubtless many of his readers have followed his example.

Publications of this kind unfortunately often fall into the hands of the young and inexperienced, with the result that their minds are saturated with teaching identical with that of the Church of Rome. Numerous books of devotion are recommended to Churchmen by their clergy, which are either composed by Roman Catholic authors, or compiled and adapted from Romish sources.

The late Dr. Pusey was an earnest worker in this department. Dr. Hook, when vicar of Leeds, complained that certain works edited by Dr. Pusey "tended evidently to encourage a Roman Catholic style of devotion," and added, "nor is it safe, since there are both Puritans and Romanisers in the Church of England, to adopt as our guide the work of one holding office amongst us, if he is known to be under the influence of any other principle than that of the English Reformation."—*The Three Reformations*, pp. 67, 68.

The words of Archbishop Whately aptly apply to the point under consideration. "Falsehood, like poison, will generally be rejected when administered alone: but when blended with wholesome ingredients may be swallowed unperceived. The mixture of truth and falsehood in the

fallacious arguments of the sophist, is one way in which this can be effected. . . . It is a great recommendation to our Church, that she appeals in all things to the Scriptures, the only collection of unmixed and infallible truth: and challenges a trial of her doctrines and practices, both collectively and separately, by that test."—*Bampton Lectures*, pp. 55, 56.

Just as the careful chemist labels laudanum "Poison," so ought to be designated such works as those we have named, lest the young and unwary should be deceived and injured. Poison mixed with wholesome food is almost as certain in its effects as if taken alone. Books of doubtful tendencies are not the less dangerous because they have gilded edges. Satan is subtle enough to know that perverted truth is far more powerful than simple falsehood.

Further proof of Ritualistic disloyalty to the Church of England is seen in the existence of certain Romanising societies, such as the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ"; the "Catholic League"; the "Guild of All Souls"; and the "English Church Union." To any who may take exception to the English Church Union being included in this category, we would commend the perusal of a pamphlet, entitled, "*The English Church Union proved from its Official and other documents to be a Romanising Confederacy*," by Presbyter Protestans. The first president of this Union, and a large number of former members, now belong to the Church of Rome.

Before us is an "Intercession paper," issued monthly to members of the "Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament." Among other things it desires prayers for the "Deliverance of the Church from the scandal of Evening Communion," and for the "Repose of the souls" of fifty-four persons. Also thanksgivings for the following so-called blessings:—Cessation of evening Communion in certain churches; the revived practice of mixing the Chalice; the restoration of Eucharistic Vestments; for several cases of "a good confession;" for "Catholic teaching," and for a priest who was "permitted to say *Mass* in church on Christmas." It is added, by order of the "Assistant Superior-General," that "the building of churches are *not objects*, unless the

Holy Sacrifice is to be frequently offered in them." Such is Ritualistic teaching! How widely different this teaching from that of the Prayer Book. The *Church Times* gives each year about May the names of nearly 300 churches in which the annual festival of this Romanising society is celebrated.

The "Catholic League" received the strong condemnation of Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln, who in a Charge (1882), after speaking of the "novel opinions in doctrine and discipline" taught by some in the Church of England, set forth the designs of the League as indicated in its own documents, thus:—"To aid by prayer and all legitimate means the revival and restoration of all Catholic devotional and ritual practices, doctrine and discipline, which have at any time been lost or obscured." One "Ward" of the League, "the Ward of Corpus Christi," is "to promote the honour of our Lord by endeavouring to restore reservation of the sacred Host in churches, chapels, etc., as well for purposes of worship, as for the use of the sick; and by endeavouring to establish one Daily Mass in all churches, and to especially seek that the *High Mass* shall be *the* Service every Sunday and holy day." The following is the first General Rule of the League:—"That all members undertake—To hear Mass on all Sundays and Holy days of obligation (unless unavoidably hindered, or dispensed by a priest). To communicate before breaking their fast. To make sacramental confession of their sins to their parish priest, or 'some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word.' To recite the *Angelus* thrice daily. To make a rule of asking the prayers of the Blessed Mary and the saints, at least on the festivals appointed by the Church in their honour. To hear Mass for the faithful departed, at least once a month, and on All Souls' day. To pray for the visible re-union of Christendom, at least once a month: and to assist that object by calling the seven sacraments and all Catholic doctrines and devotions by such names as are commonly used by Catholic Christendom. To pray for the growth of monastic life in England, and for the conversion of England to the faith of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

Such are the declared intentions of some who profess to

be English Churchmen. Who after this will venture to say that the Church of England has not within her pale disloyal members who hold and teach things contrary to God's Word?

This Romeward movement doubtless had its rise in the publication of the notorious "Tracts for the Times," the first three of which—written by J. H. Newman—appeared in 1833. Several of these tracts were reprints from the older divines; others, penned by men of acknowledged learning, set forth views which have developed into the present Ritualistic movement. The leading contributors to the tracts (which sought to inculcate the doctrines of priestly absolution, apostolical succession, prayers for the dead, the Real Presence, etc.), were E. B. Pusey, J. H. Newman, and John Keble. The organ of the Tractarians was *The British Critic*, the principles of which are seen from the following sentence:—"As we go on we must recede more and more from the principles, if any such there be, of the English Reformation."—1841.

Several of the writers of these tracts, including J. H. Newman, H. E. Manning, and R. H. Froude, speedily went over to the Church of Rome, and vast numbers have followed them. It would be difficult to say how many have passed over the bridge of Ritualism to the Church of Rome, but two typical examples may be given:—

St. Saviour's church, Leeds, was erected in 1842, under the auspices of Dr. Pusey. The actual donor of the church was unknown, all correspondence upon the subject, and all necessary business connected with it having been transacted through Dr. Pusey. From the outset the doctrines and practices of the clergy of this church were opposed to those of the Church of England. In 1850, the Bishop of Ripon held an enquiry which elicited that the duty of confessing to a Priest before receiving the Lord's Supper was systematically taught—belief in the seven sacraments inculcated—and the theory asserted that after consecration the bread in Holy Communion was no more bread, and the wine no more wine. The ultimate result of this teaching was that out of fifteen clergy connected with St. Saviour's church since its consecration in 1845—five years—*no fewer than nine seceded to the Church of Rome, taking with them several*

members of the congregation. A full account is given in the Life and Letters of Dean Hook. Dr. Hook, at the time vicar of Leeds, was much troubled at what took place, and after declaring that he had "always acted on the principles of the English Reformation," with reference to the secession to the Romish Church of the first Vicar of St. Saviour's wrote as follows:—"To true-hearted members of the Church of England, the departure of Mr. Macmullen and his disciples is a satisfaction and relief; *we may hope that all Romanisers will follow his example.* I have no sympathy with the cant of those who urge us to retain such persons in the Church, by permitting them to revile, at will, the principles of the English Reformation. When once they honestly declare themselves, these men become, like Mr. Newman, powerless; no one cares for what they say, write, or do. *When they come to us as friends they deceive the unwary."—Postcriptum to The Three Reformations.*

In the Life of "Father" Lowder, late Vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks, it is recorded that of his curates (who had been taught the use of the "Mass," vestments, with a daily offering of the Blessed Sacrifice, etc.), *two* went over to the Church of Rome in 1857, and *three* more in 1868. Thus the two Ritualistic churches named, furnished within a few years as many as *fourteen clerical converts* to the Church of Rome. Many other examples might be given did space allow. Who will venture to say in the face of evidence so undeniable that Ritualism does not lead to Rome.*

The following recent opinions of Roman Catholic leaders on the Ritualistic movement and its results are calculated to humble English Churchmen, both clerical and lay, especially those in authority, and to make them think and also act.

Dr. Vaughan, the Roman Catholic bishop of Salford, speaking at a conference in July, 1890, said:—"The very Establishment which was set up in rivalry to the Church, with a Royal supremacy triumphantly pitted against a Papal supremacy—this very Establishment has changed its temper and attitude. Its bishops, ministers, and people are busily engaged in ignoring or denouncing those very Articles which

* See also footnote on page 190.

were drawn up to be their eternal protest against the old religion. The sacramental power of orders, the need of jurisdiction, the Real Presence, the daily sacrifice, auricular confession, prayers and offices for the dead, belief in purgatory, the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, religious vows, and the institution of monks and nuns—the very doctrines stamped in the Thirty-nine Articles as fond fables and blasphemous deceits—all these are now openly taught from a thousand pulpits within the Establishment, and as heartily embraced by as many crowded congregations. Nay, more, the statue of the Blessed Virgin has been set up with honour over the principal side entrance to Westminster Abbey, and she has recently been enthroned upon a majestic altar under the great dome of St. Paul's."

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (organ of the Roman Catholic priesthood), in July, 1891, warmly acknowledges the services of English Ritualists on behalf of the Church of Rome, thus:—"There are two forces at work regarding the Catholicism of the country. One is inside the Church, and the other outside it; one Catholic, the other Protestant, though Catholicizing. *The Ritualists, and the Ritualists alone, are doing all that is being done among Protestants.* How many parsons from Newman to Rivington have been converted by priests? True, all have been *received* by priests. But how many have confessed their obligations to our sermons or our writings that we Catholic priests were in any degree answerable for their conversion? The Catholicizing movement in the Establishment has not been the result of the missionary activity of the Catholic Church in England. It is true to say that convert priests receive more converts than others, but that is mainly on account of personal influence in certain non-Catholic quarters where we have no access, as well as having a keener grasp of difficulties which we never feel. Men who pass through the fire themselves are good guides. This external movement is of vast importance. At this hour five thousand Church of England clergymen are preaching from as many Protestant pulpits the Catholic faith (not, indeed, as faith) to Catholicizing congregations, much more effectively, with less suspicion and more acceptance than we can ever hope to do. *This is, indeed, a matter for devout thankfulness.*

We could desire no better preparation for joining the Catholic Church than the Ritualists' preparatory school; and the fact that from them we have secured the majority of our converts strengthens us in our view of it."

The *Pall Mall Gazette* (August, 1891), in noticing recent perversions to the Church of Rome, including *twelve* clergymen of the English Church, says:—"The usual statistics of *conditional* baptisms and confirmations just presented [that is of those received from other churches] show that the number of conversions in each of the fifteen Catholic dioceses of England ranges from 700 to 1,000 annually."

In further confirmation of what has been stated, and in justification of the charges of Ritualistic unfaithfulness and disloyalty, we give the opinions of two learned and eminent High Churchmen, Dean Hook and Dean Burgon.

Dean Hook, in a letter to the *Guardian* in 1851, said:—"It is very true, that I have for some time expressed my dissatisfaction with the proceedings of the Romanisers, whom the writer calls Tractarians, but I take leave to make a wide distinction between a Romaniser and a High Churchman. . . . When I now find them—the Romanisers—calumniators of the Church of England, and vindicators of the Church of Rome; palliating the vices of the Romish system, and magnifying the deficiencies of the Church of England; sneering at everything Anglican, and admiring everything Romish; students of the Breviary and Missal; disciples of the schoolmen; converts to mediævalism; insinuating Romish sentiments; circulating and republishing Romish works, introducing Romish practices in their private, and infusing a Romish tone in their public devotions; introducing the Romish confessional; enjoining Romish penances; adopting Romish prostrations; recommending Romish litanies, muttering the Romish shibboleth, and rejoicing in the cant of Romish fanaticism; assuming sometimes the garb of the Romish priesthood, and venerating without imitating their celibacy; defending Romish miracles, and receiving as true the lying legends of Rome; almost adoring Romish saints, and complaining that we have had no saints in England since we purified our Church; explaining away the idolatry and pining for

the mariolatry of the Church of Rome; vituperating the English Reformation, and receiving for the truth the false doctrines of the Council of Trent; when I find them whispering in the ears of credulous ignorance in high places, as well as in low, that the two Churches are in principle the same. . . . I conceive that I am bound as a High Churchman to remain stationary, and not to follow them in their down-falling. I believe it to be incumbent upon every High Churchman to declare plainly that it is not merely in detail, that it is not merely in the application of our principles, but in our principles themselves, that we differ from the Church of Rome; and that no man can secede to Rome, the system of which is opposed to the truth as it is in Jesus, without placing his soul in peril, and risking his salvation."

Dean Burgon, in a memorable sermon, preached in Oxford in 1873, on *Romanizing within the Church of England*, strongly condemned the un-English character of the Rome-ward movement. Speaking of the Ritualistic clergy, he said:—"They introduce the *phraseology* of Rome; whereby Englishmen's ears become familiarised to a vocabulary which represents tenets which their Church entirely disallows. Next, these men assimilate the furniture of God's House, and especially of God's Table—as far as they possibly can—to the Romish type; so that you might sometimes suppose that you must surely be in a church belonging to members of the Romish communion. . . . When we encounter tokens of an unfaithful yearning towards Romish tenets, Romish practices, Romish institutions, so that to conform our services, our usages, our ritual, as far as practicable to the Romish type, is evidently the grand object of the restless and unscrupulous party I speak of, the result of which is that we cannot always recognise our own clergy when we see them, and may be excused if we fail to recognise our Prayer Book Services either: *then*, silence becomes no longer possible. It is to connive at the scandal to witness it without remonstrance. A snare is being laid for the young and unwary, against which they must by all means be set on their guard. A dishonour is being done to our Church, and by her own ministers too, which is not to be endured."

Sufficient has been said to show that the Church of England is passing through "perilous times," and to prove that Romish ceremonies and doctrines of the most

pronounced character are openly practised and taught by many of her clergy. The doctrines of a Church must be judged by the standards of that Church, and not by the opinions or actions of individual members.

In the chapters which follow we shall endeavour to show from her authorised formularies, and the writings of some of her most eminent divines, the true position of the Church of England with regard to her Doctrine, her Ministry, and the Sacraments. We shall seek to establish the truth that the Church of God is no mere earthly hierarchy, but that it includes all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; that the Christian minister is not a sacrificing priest, but an ambassador for God; that the Sacrament of Baptism does not of itself regenerate the soul, but is a "sign" and "seal" of regeneration; that the Lord's Supper is not a Propitiatory Sacrifice for sin, but a Memorial of the Perfect Sacrifice of Christ; that no absolution can avail save that which is Divine; and that Prayers for the Departed have no Scripture warrant.

To be silent amid the teaching of error is to sanction it. To sanction error is to sin against God, and to set at nought His command which bids us to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." It has been rightly observed, that when we cease to protest against error we are in danger of being drawn into it. There are always persons ready to side with error, and charge those who oppose it with a lack of charity. But St. Paul's words must be remembered and acted upon, "Charity rejoiceth in the truth."

> "Away with charity that soothes a lie,
> And thrusts the truth with scorn and anger by."

These pages are written not for party ends, but for the cause of God and truth, and in defence of Catholic doctrine, Apostolic practice, and Evangelical principles.

If Churchmen knew more concerning the history of their Church, and gave more earnest study to the Bible, Prayer Book, and Articles, we are pursuaded that they would not readily give their sanction to practices and doctrines which are essentially Romish and anti-scriptural, the tendency of which is to cause men to look from the one Great High

Priest in heaven to erring earthly priests, and from God's Word to human traditions.

Attempts are being made to put on one side the Apostolic text—"What saith the Scripture?" and to substitute the Romish cry—"What saith the Church?" The Apostles were not blameless; ancient Fathers, so often quoted, made mistakes. General Councils, as our Church declares in Article XIX., "may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God." Such noble men as Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and others, had their errors and failings. Such being the fact, it is evident that apostle, father, confessor, martyr, theologian, must only be followed so far as they themselves followed Christ. The words of Bishop Davenant, of Salisbury, written nearly 250 years ago, need to be pondered at the present day—"We are not to believe all who undertake to teach in the Church, but must take care and weigh, with serious examination, whether their doctrine be sound or no."

All Church teaching must be brought to the test of God's Word. This practice was commended in the Apostolic age (Acts xvii. 11), and he who follows the example of the Bereans in this matter is the best Catholic and the truest Churchman. The Scriptures, as Article VI. of our Church distinctly declares, are the one standard of faith and practice.

Shall we be guilty of the old folly of crying, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace?" God forbid! Well would it be for all Churchmen to bear in mind St. Augustine's definition of a Christian teacher. Says that great thinker—"He is one who, being the defender of the true faith, and the vanquisher of error, teaches what is good, and unteaches what is bad."

This must be our position as Churchmen. We are all, more or less, teachers. May it be ours to have faith in God, resting assured that in the end truth must prevail. We have hope in the future of our beloved Church. God has blessed and preserved her in the past, and He is still the same. It is needful that there should be heresies—self-chosen views—in the Church, that they which are approved of God may be made manifest (1 Cor. xi. 19). We would close this chapter with words of Archbishop Benson,

not long since uttered, and of another who has departed hence, but whose memory will long be gratefully cherished by churchmen in England and America—Bishop McIlvaine. The bishop says—"There is the duty of contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints—a duty which will remain as long as sin and Satan continue on the earth, and no love of peace can excuse us from the conflict required, though it be unto death. With all error that wars against the Gospel we must be at war. The bond of peace in which we are exhorted to keep the unity of the Spirit, does not bind us to be at peace with hurtful error, but it does bind us to be at peace, as much as in *us* lies, with such as are in error. 'Speaking the truth *in love*,' is the Apostle's precept for all such circumstances." (*Memorials*, p. 378). The Archbishop's words are—"What is false will pass away; what is true must harmonise with the other truth, that to this end Christ both died and rose, and revived, that He might be Lord, both of the dead and the living. We shall often be perplexed, and shall faint, hardly seeing the truth. But the Church of Christ is a Church of Prayer and Praise; and this is the sum of her worship—'Hold thou us up, and we shall be safe.'"

> "Thou, who in darkness walking didst appear
> Upon the waves, and Thy disciples cheer,
> Come, Lord, in lonesome days, when storms assail,
> And earthly hopes and human succours fail;
> When all is dark, may we behold Thee nigh,
> And hear Thy Voice, 'Fear not,—for it is I.'"

The Holy Catholic Church.

"The Church of God."

BEFORE considering the principles and doctrines of the Church of England, it is important that we should have clear and Scriptural knowledge concerning the characteristics of that Holy Catholic Church in which we declare our belief, and of which the Church of England claims to be a branch.

It need scarcely be said that the exact ideas involved in the word Church—the questions concerning its powers, its nature, its modes of governance, its relation to Holy Scripture, and its relation to the State—have for many centuries been fruitful matters of controversy.

It will be helpful throughout our inquiry to bear in mind the words of a thoughtful writer:—"The Church of Christ is immeasurable by human language, invisible in its completeness to human eye. It can be defined only approximately; its whole form is known only to God."

The English word *Church* (like the Scottish *Kirk*, and the German *Kirche*) is derived from the Greek κυριακόν, *belonging to the Lord.* The New Testament word translated Church is εκκλησία—a word which originally denoted an *assembly of persons called out*—a *congregation.*

The word Church is used in several ways which it is important to distinguish, viz.:—

(1) A building set apart for public worship—the *Lord's*

House. In this sense it was very early used by the Greek Fathers.

(2) A body of Christians meeting for worship in a private house—"Aquila and Priscilla—with the *Church* that is in their house" (1 Cor. xvi. 19).

(3) Professing Christians in a particular city or place, "the *Church* which was at Jerusalem" (Acts viii. 1).

(4) A body of Christians observing the same rites, and acknowledging the same ecclesiastical authority, as the *Church of England*, the *Church of Rome*, the *Presbyterian Church*, etc.

(5) The aggregate of religious influences. Hence we speak of *the power of the Church* as opposed to some form of moral evil.

(6) The whole *visible* Church, *i.e.*, "all who profess and call themselves Christians," including sincere believers and false professors (Matt. xiii. 30).

(7) The *mystical* or *invisible* Church, *i.e.*, the body of God's elect; called, regenerated, justified, and sanctified. All true believers from the beginning of time to the end. (Eph. v. 27.)

It will be seen that careful discrimination is needed in the use of the word Church. The absence of this has caused much confusion and many misunderstandings. For lack thereof, as Hooker has observed, "the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed."

Viewing the word *Church* as referring to a society or community of persons called out and united for a great end, we find in the New Testament that the Church is mainly presented under two forms or aspects, referred to by theologians as the Church *Visible* and the Church *Invisible*, the one on earth only, a society, with its officers, rules, and sacraments known to men by certain visible tokens; the other of persons both in heaven and on earth, who from the beginning of time to the end shall have believed in God, and who shall eternally reign with Him in glory as the Church triumphant. This Body, for the most part invisible to men, is the Church of God in its grandest and widest sense.

Hence the Church in her *visible* aspect consists of all who profess and call themselves Christians, and is thus defined

by the Church of England in Article XIX. :—"The *Visible Church* of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

The Church in her *mystical* or *invisible* aspect is described in Article XVII. as consisting of "those whom God hath chosen in Christ out of mankind," who, "called, justified, adopted, walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, attain to everlasting felicity." A thanksgiving prayer in our Communion Service has reference to the same in the words "the *mystical* body of Thy Son which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

It is the Church of God in this mystical or invisible aspect that the Scriptures describe under such names as:—The Body of Christ, the Flock, the Bride, a Holy Temple, a Royal Priesthood, the Household of Faith, etc. It is to this company of faithful people,

"The Church of God's Elect,"

that Jehovah's gracious promises of love, mercy, and blessedness strictly belong

On this important matter some in our Church hold a theory which neither accords with Scripture, nor agrees with the opinions of some of the most eminent writers of our Church. Here are two examples of this teaching.

In "Church Doctrine—Bible Truth" (Sadler) the author, speaking of the Church (pp. 41, 85), says:—"This body has always been an outward and visible body, known by certain outward and visible marks . . . If our services are to be Scriptural, they must give no countenance to the idea that there are two Churches—a visible and an invisible—to the former of which we are supposed to be admitted at baptism, whilst God has restricted saving grace to the latter. Our services recognise but one Church, the visible, into which the person is admitted at baptism."

In the "Church and its Services" (Garnier), published by the S. P. C. K., the author says:—"What then is this

Church of Christ? First of all it is *visible*. That is to say, you can tell whether you and others belong to it or not. There are those who assert that the Church is *invisible*, known only to God. In other words, there is no admission to it except for those who are converted. But this is not the Church of Holy Scripture . . . A second conception has been put forward that there is *a visible Church, and within it an invisible Church*, and that the visible Church consists of the baptized, and the invisible Church of the converted, consequently, exhortations are not infrequently to be met with, warning people not to rest content with belonging to the visible Church, but to press forward till they attain to that inner and invisible Church. But from end to end of Holy Scriptures there is no echo of this teaching What is found is repeated mention of one Church which is unquestionably visible."

Teaching such as this we believe to be most erroneous and misleading. Certainly it differs greatly from that of many of the greatest theologians of our Church. Let us hear what some of these say!

Richard Hooker writes :—"For lack of diligent observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible sound and corrupted, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed. . . . As the everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church; even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company."—*Eccles: Polity.* Book iii., chap i.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says :—"The professors of Christ's doctrine are but imperfectly and inchoatively the Church of God, but they who are indeed holy and obedient to Christ's laws of faith and manners, these are truly and perfectly 'the Church.' The mere profession of Christianity makes no man a member of Christ. The *invisible* Church ordinarily and regularly is part of the *visible*, but yet that only part which is the true one. The rest in common speaking are the Church; not in mystical union, not in proper relation to Christ; they are not the House of God, not the Temple of the Holy Ghost, not the members of

Christ. So that which we call the Church is a 'mixed assembly.' Here then are two senses of the word 'Church,' God's sense and man's sense; the sense of religion, and the sense of government; common rites and spiritual union."—*Dissuasive from Popery.* Part ii., Book i., sec. i.

Dr. Isaac Barrow says—"All (saith St. Paul) are not Israel who are of Israel, nor is he a Jew who is one outwardly, yet in regard of the conjunction of the rest with the faithful Israelites, because of the external consent in the same profession, and conspiring in the same services, all the congregation of Israel is styled a holy nation, and peculiar people. The places therefore of Scripture, which do represent the Church one, as unquestionably they belong (in their principal notion and intent) to the true universal Church (called the Church mystical and invisible), so may they by analogy and participation be understood to concern the visible Church Catholic here on earth, which professeth faith in Christ, and obedience to His laws."—*Unity of the Church. Works*, Vol. iii., p. 205.

Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, says—"The Church is visible as far only as is seen by men; it is invisible as it is known by God. The *visible* Church contains both *bad* and good; the invisible consists of *good only.* In the visible are *wheat* and chaff, *wheat* and *tares* mixed together; in the invisible *wheat* alone. The one is the Church of the *called*, the other of the *elect of God only.*" (Matt. xxii. 14.) — *Theophilus Anglicanus.* Edition ix., p. 14.

Dr. J. C. Vaughan, Dean of Llandaff, says—"The Catholic Church embraces all persons baptized, and not excommunicated; all who profess to believe, and all who are willing to worship. But the Communion of Saints is a community of true Christians; of persons really indwelt by the Holy Ghost, really living a life of faith in the Son of God. The two societies *are not*, therefore, co-extensive. Alas! the visible Church has many unsound, many inconsistent, many false and hypocritical members, and the Communion of Saints is therefore thus far a smaller body within a larger, a Church within a Church, a society contained in, not co-ordinate or commensurate with, the other." —*Good Words*, 1867, p. 835.

That this two-fold* aspect of the Church, notwithstanding admitted difficulties, is in accordance with Scripture, may be seen from the teaching of the Seven Parables of the Kingdom (Matt. xiii.), in which the origin, growth, state, progress, and consummation of the Church, are set forth by Christ Himself. And St. Paul's words accord—"He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Rom. ii. 28, 29.)

Where then on earth shall we look for the true Church? The Church of Rome asserts her claim to the exclusion of all other Churches, and there are not a few, both in the Church of England and outside, whose words indicate the same narrow spirit. How many there are, *e.g.*, in our own Church, who maintain government by bishops to be essential to the existence of the Church, declaring that only through them can the grace of the Sacraments be given. Such say that the one true Church is limited to three branches—the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican, and refuse to acknowledge that ministers and congregations outside belong to the Church of God. It need scarcely be said that for *such* a theory there is no Scripture authority whatever.

For a perfect Church on earth we shall search in vain, for, as our Article truly declares, "In the visible Church the evil is ever mingled with the good." The famous words of Irenæus, a Latin Father of the second century, have often been quoted, and may be repeated here—"Ubi Ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic Ecclesia et omnis gratia." *Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God;*

---

* Since this chapter was written we have seen this two-fold view of the Church maintained by Professor Jowett who, in a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey, said, "Higher and more ideal than any visible Church is the invisible. Sometimes men have sought to clothe the visible Church with the attributes of the invisible." Bishop Perowne, in a published sermon, says, "The language of Scripture is plain and explicit; it speaks both of a visible, and an invisible body—the one the outward image, the other the inward and hidden reality." The Rev. H. C. G. Moule upholds the same view in his *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, p. 205.

and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace.

> "What is a Church? Let truth and reason speak,
> They would reply, 'The faithful, pure, and meek,
> From Christian folds—the one selected race
> Of all professions, and of every place.'"

We have stated that the Church of God is a society formed of individuals. As such it has necessarily an external manifestation. We view it as a visible organisation—a great society with its members, officers, principles, and laws—a society whose duty it is to witness for holiness and truth, and to contend against sin and error, "the Church of Christ militant here on earth." But as it has been truly said the external government and appointed ordinances of the Church do not constitute the Church's essence; they only belong to her earthly manifestation. God works by means, and the Word, the Ministry, and the Sacraments, are given to the Church that she, as a wise Steward, may dispense the manifold gifts of grace.

It will be borne in mind that we are now speaking, not of the Jewish Church, but of the Church founded by Christ, of which the former was in many respects typical. The first Christian Church may be said to have consisted of the little company named in John i. 35-41. During the three years of Christ's earthly ministry others were called. After our Lord's ascension the Church held its assemblies at Jerusalem, as recorded in Acts i. 13-15. At Pentecost three thousand souls were led into its fold. Thenceforward it went on increasing, "the Lord adding to it daily such as were being saved." (Acts ii. 41-47.) The early growth of the Church, her leading principles, and her missionary work, are fully set forth in the Book of Acts and the Epistles. And this Church, founded by Christ more than eighteen hundred years ago, notwithstanding repeated assaults by the powers of evil, still continues, and shall endure a *visible* Church, until her work on earth is finished, until Christ is preached to all nations, until God's people are fully gathered in, until Christ comes again. Then the earthly aspect of the Church shall cease—the scaffolding of the Temple around which so much fierce controversy has raged shall be removed

—all that offends shall be cast out, the Holy Catholic Church shall be fully manifest, "a great multitude which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues," shall be presented to the Great Father of all as the great outcome of a Saviour's redeeming love, "a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." (Rev. vii. 9; Eph. v. 27.)

> Then—"the great Church victorious,
> Shall be the Church at rest."

We have considered the Church of God in its twofold aspect, visible and invisible, and have shown that such a view accords with the Scriptures and Prayer-Book, also with the writings of eminent Churchmen. Let us now examine some of the leading characteristics or "Notes" of the Church.

The Homily for Whitsunday defines the Church thus:—"The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks whereby it is known; pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline."—*Edition S.P.C.K.*, p. 494.

In the Creeds are given four "Notes" or "Marks" by which the True Church may be known. She is *One—Catholic—Apostolic*—and *Holy*.

(*a*) ONE.—"There is *one* Body." In all essential points the members of Christ's Church are united. They acknowledge one Great Head, Christ. They follow one rule of faith, the Word of God. They observe the same Sacraments. They may differ as to government and ceremonies, and may be found in different ecclesiastical folds here below, but they compose one flock, follow one Shepherd, are taught by one Spirit, and are animated by one hope, "the blessed hope of eternal life." The Church's faith is unchanged and unchangeable. During the present imperfect stage of our existence there will be differences of opinion on certain points. Such are often more apparent than real. Satan

seeks to magnify them. But the unity of the True Church is a fact notwithstanding. All believers are "one in Christ Jesus." "I believe that unity of doctrine is more than unity of government, and unity of faith and life more than unity of ritual and ceremonies."—*Dean Perowne.* "The Church is a living organism, operating through diverse members and by diverse functions, yet all holding to the One Divine Head, nourished by the One Divine Blood, breathing the One Divine Breath of Life."—*Bishop Stevens.* "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Ephesians iv. 4-6.) Christ prayed that His people *all* might be *one.* For this the Church longs. For this all Christian people should strive. God's elect completely gathered in, earthly folds shall be broken up, and earthly distractions cease. Love shall reign supreme. "There shall be One Flock and One Shepherd."

(*b*) CATHOLIC.—"Diffused through the several ages and places and nations of the world."—*Bishop Beveridge.* This term, though not in the Bible, had a place in the Creeds of the Church at a very early period. It denotes that the Church of Christ is not restricted to any particular nation, as was the Jewish Church, but that it is *universal*, or world-wide, in its benefits.

> "Elect from every nation,
> Yet one o'er all the earth."

Catholic, then, simply means *universal.* The expression "Holy *Catholic* Church" in the Creed has its counterparts in the "holy Church *universal*" of the Litany, and the "Holy Church *throughout all the world*" of the Te Deum. Our Lord, just prior to His ascension, commissioned His disciples, saying, "Go teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. xxviii. 19.) From the day this commission was given, the Church has been engaged in carrying it out. The Catholicity of the Church is declared by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. "Them that are sanctified in

Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Christ Jesus our Lord, both theirs and ours." (1 Cor. i. 2.) Every congregation of faithful men in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be ministered according to Christ's ordinance, is a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church.

(*c*) APOSTOLIC.—Apostolicity is an important mark of the Church of Christ. True Apostolicity does not consist in any mere historical succession of ministers, however important that may be, but in the adherence to Apostolic order and the preaching of Apostolic doctrine. Every teacher who holds the doctrine and witnesses for the great truths which the Apostles taught, and who seeks to follow them as they followed Christ, is a member of the Apostolic Church. A concise summary of Apostolic doctrine is contained in each of the Three Creeds. The Church of God is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii. 20). We read of the early Christians that "they continued stedfastly in the *Apostles' doctrine* and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.) May it be ours, by God's grace, to emulate their example. Much is heard of so-called *Catholic* teaching. Test it, as did the Bereans, by the Scriptures, and see if it be in accordance with the Apostles' doctrine. If not, it cannot be Apostolical, and must therefore be rejected.

(*d.*) The Church of God is HOLY.—It is so designated in the Nicene Creed. It is holy with regard to its Divine Founder—its perfect laws—its unchanging spirit—and its glorious end. "A *holy* nation"—holy in spite of the manifold imperfections of many of its members on earth. Its true members are regenerated and taught by the Holy Spirit, and are commanded to live holy lives. To each the Spirit speaks—"Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." (2 Tim. ii. 19). Does a person commit sin or sanction it? If so, it is a proof that as yet he is not a loyal member of the *Holy* Catholic Church. Consequently, he can have no part in that kingdom which is holy. "The Church I believe in general holy in respect of the Author, end, institution, and administration of it; particularly in the members; here I acknowledge it really, and

in the same hereafter perfectly holy."—*Bishop Pearson on the Creed.* "The Holy Catholic Church, a number that will serve God here and enjoy Him in eternity. *Universal*, diffused through the various ages, places, and nations of the world. *Holy*, washed in the blood of Christ, and sanctified by His Spirit."—*Bishop Beveridge.*

Such, then, we believe to be the leading features of the Church of God. It is One—Catholic—Apostolic—Holy. It has a two-fold aspect. There are not two Churches, but as St. Augustine declares, two states or conditions of the One Church—indicated by leading theologians as "visible" and "invisible." It is possible to have a name and a place in the visible Church, and yet not to be inscribed in the Lamb's Book of Life. "Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything." Baptism of itself cannot give life to the soul. The Lord's Supper, apart from a living faith, profiteth nothing. There must be a new creation (John iii. 3); a faith working by love (Gal. v. 6); a keeping of the commandments of God (1 Cor. vii. 19); the fruits of the Spirit (2 Pet. i. 5-11). These are the essential marks of all who truly belong to the Church of God. "The Lord knoweth them that are His."

Questions concerning the Church, its characteristics, its work, and its end, are stirring the minds of men. Let us seek for truth carefully and earnestly, determined, by God's help, not to be swayed by party faction. We hear much as to the voice of the Church. Let us ever remember that the Church's perfect utterances are to be found, not in writings of the Fathers, nor yet in the decrees of Councils, or declarations of Popes, but in the Word of God, and there only.

The words of our Church in the beautifully comprehensive Prayer for all Conditions of Men may fitly close this chapter:—

"O God, the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, we humbly beseech Thee for all sorts and conditions of men; that Thou wouldest be pleased to make Thy ways known unto them, Thy saving health unto all nations. More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church; that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians

may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life. . . . . And this we beg for Jesus Christ His sake. Amen"

"Christ is made the sure Foundation,
Christ the Head and Corner-stone,
Chosen of the Lord, and precious,
Binding all the Church in one,
Holy Sion's help for ever,
And her confidence alone."

The Church of England.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation."

THE Church of England is a branch of that Catholic and Apostolic Church described in the last chapter. She does not, like the Church of Rome, claim to be *the* Church, outside of which there can be no salvation, but she asserts her right to be regarded as a true branch of the Church of Christ.

The National Church of this land is not a new Church, dating only from the time of the Reformation, as some erroneously suppose; nor had she her beginnings with the preaching of the Roman monk, Augustine (A.D. 596), as others have affirmed. It is well that Churchmen should look carefully into history and see how little foundation there is for the belief, that England owes its Christianity mainly, if not entirely, to St. Augustine and the Roman Mission.

Tertullian, a Roman writer (A.D. 201), says:—"*Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita*"—"Regions of the Britons, inaccessible to the Romans, have assuredly been subdued to Christ."

When, or by whom, the Gospel was first preached in Britain is uncertain. Eusebius points to Apostolic times; and Bede speaks of missionaries being sent from Rome at the request of Lucius, a British king; both statements, however, lack confirmatory evidence.

Prior to the invasion of the Saxons and Angles in the fifth century, our land was inhabited by Britons, who

possessed a duly organised Christian Church and ministry under episcopal government. Proofs of this are seen in (1) The representation of the British Church by three of her bishops—Eborius, of York; Restitutus, of London; and Adelfius, of Caerleon—in 314, at the Council of Arles, in France. (2) The British Church furnished martyrs to the faith during the terrible persecution under the Emperor Diocletian early in the fourth century, among whom was St. Alban, who refused to sacrifice to the gods, and declared himself a Christian; (3) The decree convening the great Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), in which the Church of *Britain* is specially mentioned. These facts prove the existence of a flourishing Church in this country nearly three hundred years before the arrival of Augustine and his band of missionaries from Rome, in 596.

By the Saxon invasions, Christianity was driven back, the Christians having to flee into Wales and the West.

It must be remembered that at this time England was not one, but many kingdoms. On his arrival, Augustine found no fewer than seven British bishops and one archbishop. Bertha, who had married Ethelbert, king of Kent, was a Christian, and had brought with her Luidhard as chaplain. A great part of the country was, however, owing to the Saxon invasions, practically heathen. Augustine worked with much zeal and considerable success so far as Kent was concerned, for on Whitsunday, 597, Ethelbert, king of Kent, and his court, were baptised, and shortly afterwards Augustine was appointed the first Archbishop of Canterbury. But in the end, as history shows, Augustine's mission was not a lasting success, as many of the converts lapsed into heathenism, leaving England as a whole to be evangelised by missionaries other than those of the Roman Church.

It is noteworthy that at this time the British Church, which had its own liturgy (see p. 151), was strong enough to make its influence felt, and successfully resisted the demands of Augustine by refusing to alter certain customs respecting the time of keeping Easter, the use of the tonsure, and the mode of baptism. Moreover, its clergy declined to be subject to the pope. Thus, as a recent writer (Lane) has observed, "The resistance of the British Church to the

demands of Augustine is the first of a long series of protests on the part of Christians in Britain against papal supremacy, so that when the Church of this country is said to be "*Protestant*," we ought not to understand that it has objected to papal influence over it from the times of the Tudor kings only, but that it has never willingly allowed to the bishops of Rome any legal jurisdiction over Churchmen in this realm."

The Church of England is the old historic Church of the land, and it is of the utmost importance to have clear and accurate conceptions as to the connection between it and the Roman Church in early times, and also respecting the Evangelization of England.

The important extracts which follow relating to these points are from the writings of two great authorities.

Bishop Wordsworth (Lincoln) says:—"No trace whatever can be found of the Bishop of Rome having exercised any ecclesiastical authority in England for the first *six hundred years after* Christ; and it is certain that England did not receive her Christianity at first through Rome."—(*Theophilus Anglicanus*, p. 138). And again in his *Church History*—"The mission of St. Augustine was comparatively sterile in England, whether we regard extent of space or duration of time. Truth requires us to declare that St. Augustine from Italy ought not to be called the Apostle of England, much less the Apostle of Scotland, but the title ought to be given to St. Columba and his followers from Iona."

Bishop Lightfoot (Durham), after affirming that the Church in our land had its beginning before the English Crown, the English Parliament, the English nation itself came into being, proceeds thus respecting the Celtic mission of Iona and Lindisfarne:—"For thirty long years Iona was the centre of St. Columba's evangelistic work. Never man laboured more earnestly or more successfully for Christ. When the sixth century was fast drawing to its close, he passed away—some three or four weeks after Augustine had landed on the shores of Kent. His missionary work was altogether independent of Rome. The Roman legions had long been withdrawn from Britain. They had never penetrated into Ireland. But the influence of the Roman

Church was largely dependent on the extension of the Roman Empire. Hence Celtic Christianity grew up a strictly native growth. The influence of Rome for long centuries was practically unfelt. Whether for good or for evil, the island of the saints developed a type of Christian civilisation and Christian character peculiar to itself. Long after the English Church had submitted to the Roman domination, the Irish Church remained essentially free. It was not till the twelfth century when Adrian, the English Pope, made over Ireland to Henry II., that along with the English conquest the yoke of Roman dictation was firmly riveted on the neck of the ancient Irish Church. This independence Columba brought with him to his new island home off the west coast of Scotland. Iona became now the light of Christendom. For many generations it was the centre of the great Evangelistic movements of the time. Not England or Scotland only, but large parts of the continent also were Christianised by these Irish missionaries, either from their adopted home in Iona, or from their mother country. And what of Northumbria meanwhile? Paulinus had advanced northwards from the Roman mission in Kent; he had preached for a time to our pagan forefathers in Northumbria; but he had made no way. Disheartened by his patron's defeat and death, he abandoned the field and retired southward to a more congenial sphere of work. The country remained pagan still. Not a single church, not a single altar, no symbol of the Gospel of any kind, we are told, had been erected between the Forth and the Tees. For the Christian missionary it was virgin soil still. Then Iona stepped in where Rome had failed. Some two years after the retreat of Paulinus, Aidan left the shores of Iona and took up his abode at Lindisfarne. Oswald, the king, educated as an exile in Iona, naturally sought thence the teacher who should win his newly-recovered kingdom for Christ. The story of Aidan's selection for the work is too well known to need repetition here. It is a noble testimony to the character of the man, his simplicity and his gentleness, his absolute self-renunciation, and his unflinching faith. It was in the year 635—a little more than seventy years after Columba landed in Iona—just thirty years after the death of Augustine, that Aidan commenced his work. Though

nearly forty years had elapsed since Augustine's first landing in England, Christianity was still confined to its first conquest—the south-east corner of the island—the kingdom of Kent. Beyond this border, though ground had been broken here and there, no territory had been permanently acquired for the Gospel. Then commenced those thirty years of earnest energetic labour, carried on by these Celtic missionaries and their disciples from Lindisfarne as their spiritual citadel, which ended in the submission of England to the gentle yoke of Christ. Not Augustine, but Aidan, is the true Apostle of England. . . . The independence of the Celtic missions again is a patent fact, and stands out in strong contrast to later evangelistic movements in Western Europe. Rome neither initiated nor controlled these Celtic missions. The missionaries owed allegiance, not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Presbyter-Abbot of Iona. There is no evidence that they sought or accepted any authoritative directions from the Roman mission in the South of England. Their usages were different in many respects from the usages of Rome. When these came under discussion, and it was a question between allegiance to Iona and allegiance to Rome, they unhesitatingly chose the former."—*Leaders in the Northern Church*, pp. 6-8.

About the close of the seventh century, the British and Roman Churches commenced to merge under Archbishop Theodore, who began to organise the parochial system, and also introduced a practice before unknown to the English Church—that of auricular confession.

It would be foreign to the plan of this work to give even an outline of the history of the Church of England during the centuries which preceded the Reformation. Suffice it to say that from the beginning of the eighth century to the middle of the sixteenth she became gradually assimilated both in doctrine and practice to the Church of Rome, until at last the papal power became supreme both in Church and State. The ecclesiastical authority of Rome was—especially after the Norman Conquest—enforced, until it became a burden too grievous to be borne. Still there was always a strong national Protestant party opposed to the pretensions and encroachments of Rome. In 1213, the weak-minded King John sold his kingdom to the Pope, promising on

oath to hold the kingdom "as the Pope's vassal," and binding himself to pay an annual tribute of one thousand marks, in addition to the usual Peter's pence, etc. The Barons, under the leadership of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, forced the unworthy king to sign the famous *Magna Charta*—still the fundamental charter of English liberties. Written in Latin, its very first clause translated reads—"That the *Church of England* shall be free, and hold her rights entire, and her liberties inviolate." The Barons were excommunicated by the Pope, and for a time the papacy triumphed. As English history conclusively proves, our land became one great field for papal imposition and plunder.

From time to time noble-hearted men as Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury, Grossetete, Bishop of Lincoln, and John Wyclif, a Yorkshireman, "the morning star of the Reformation," rose up to protest against the growing corruption and tyranny of the Church of Rome. At length the Church of England was freed from the fetters which had so long bound her—freed at the cost of much suffering, and the life-blood of many a martyr. At the Reformation she regained spiritual, temporal, and intellectual freedom. As a consequence we have the important declaration in Article XXXVII., "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England." By this mighty movement the supremacy of England's sovereign was restored; the right of private judgment secured, and the Scriptures declared to be the sole rule in matters of faith. How much, under God, England owes to the Reformation can never be told. It was, as Dean Hook says, a "glorious and blessed epoch."*

We have already considered the marks or "Notes" of the Church of Christ as set forth in the three Creeds, wherein she is declared to be One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.

---

* "The question of the English Reformation was eminently and specially national. . . . The main subject of contention between the State and the Romanists was not their adhesion to this or that popish doctrine, but their acknowledgment of an unnational and anti-national head. To meet this the Oath of Supremacy was framed." —Mr. Gladstone, *Church and State*, p. 190.

So far as a visible Church can, and the nature of things will permit, the Church of England possesses these marks. That she claims such is clear from her Liturgy and Articles. She prays for unity and exhorts to holiness. She is Catholic. By Catholic we do not mean mediæval. Many of the prominent doctrines of the middle ages were certainly not Catholic. The Catholicity of the Church of England is specially exhibited in the great missionary agencies whereby she earnestly seeks to make known to all nations the blessings of the Gospel. Her right to be called Apostolic is based, not on any mere continuity of Apostolical succession which may be claimed for her ministry, but on the fact that she is founded upon Apostolic principles, proclaims Apostolic truth, and enjoins Apostolic practice.

The doctrines of the Church of England are fully and clearly indicated in the Prayer Book, especially in the Catechism and the Thirty-nine Articles. All her clergy, when ordained, solemnly declare that they believe the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the Prayer Book and Articles to be agreeable to the Word of God. As it is not unusual to hear the Articles disparaged, the following testimonies to their authority and value are given :—

Bishop Stillingfleet says—"The doctrine of the Church of England is contained in the Thirty-nine Articles; and, whatever the opinions of private persons may be, this is the standard by which the sense of our Church is to be taken."

Bishop Burnet says—"The Thirty-nine Articles are the sum of our doctrines, and the confession of our faith."

Bishop Beveridge says—"The bishops and clergy of both provinces of this nation, held at London, 1562, agreed upon certain Articles of Religion, to the number of thirty-nine, which to-day remain the constant and settled doctrine of our Church."—*Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 1716.

Bishop Christopher Wordsworth writes—"The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion contain an exposition of the doctrines of the Church of England—they contain no *enactment* of anything *new* in doctrine, but they are only a *declaration* of what is *old*. In them, the *Church of England* affirms that HOLY SCRIPTURE containeth *all things* necessary to Salvation."—*Theophilus Anglicanus*, pp. 178-9.

Bishop Barry writes—"It would be unreasonable to suppose that they—the Articles—could not be amended, in the light of the experience and advance of knowledge gained in the last three hundred years. But substantially they embody the true fundamental principles of Christian faith and ecclesiastical constitution, which still meet our needs. . . They have necessarily a didactic value, as expository of Anglican doctrine on many important points. It is unfortunately obvious, from language popularly used about them, that they are very imperfectly known and understood; and it is certain that they would reward far more attentive study."—*Teachers' Prayer Book*, 1890.

On this point of doctrine the language of Article VI. deserves careful attention:—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." With this should be read Articles XX. and XXI., the former of which declares that "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written;" whilst the other asserts that things ordained by general councils "as necessary to salvation, have neither strength or authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." The *Lambeth Conference* of Bishops, in 1888, affirmed the Holy Scriptures as "being the rule and ultimate standard of faith." Thus it will be seen that the Church of England is essentially a *Scriptural* Church.

The Church of England is moreover a NATIONAL Church. In 1701, by statute 12 and 13 Wm. III., c. ii., it is enacted that whosoever shall come to the possession of the crown of England "shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established." This Act, along with the Act settling the Protestant succession of the Crown, called the "Bill of Rights," passed in 1689, form a most powerful bulwark against papal supremacy in our land.

Our Church is National, not in the sense of a State established Church with a State-paid clergy, but in the higher sense indicated in the words of the learned Dr. Döllinger, who says:—"No Church is so national, and firmly rooted in the affection of the people, so grown

together with the institutions and customs of the nation." The Church of England was never established by any Act of Parliament, as some seem to imagine. It is far older than the State, but the two have so grown together as to become "the warp and woof of the national life." Says Dr. Freeman, the eminent historian, "There was no one moment, no one Act of Parliament, when and by which the Church was established."

Mr. Gladstone, in reply to the question, "Wherein now consists or by what signs is attested the nationality of the Church of England?" gives twenty marks, the first three of which are:—"(1) By the necessity that the Sovereign should be a member of it, and that his membership should be ascertained in the true authentic manner, *viz.*, through the act of communion. (2) By the necessity that the Lord High Chancellor, the Keeper of the Sovereign's conscience, should likewise be of the Church. (3) By the Coronation Service, both in the sense of its terms, and in the performance of its distinctive act by the Archbishop of Canterbury."—*The State in its relations with the Church*, p. 238.

Disestablishment and Disendowment. The union of Church and State, *i.e.*, the special recognition of the Church of England by the State, is objected to by some Nonconformists, who have formed a Society called the Liberation Society. The union is by no means essential to the well-being and existence of the Church. "The union of Church and State (said Lord Eldon) is not to make the Church political, but the State religious." As the late Bishop Wilberforce said: "There is one thing of which I am convinced, that whilst an Establishment is to a particular Church in many ways a blessing unspeakable, no Church which cannot stand without an Establishment is worth being established." [See chap. on "Church and State."]

The great work of the Church of England for the spiritual, social, and educational advancement of the people will be found indicated in the chapter on "Church Work and Progress." Although spiritual work cannot be tabulated, the facts given prove the great vitality of our national Church, and furnish abundant grounds for gratitude and continued consecrated effort.

The Church of England is also a PROTESTANT Church. Whilst she is a witness for the truth, she protests against error. This is in no wise inconsistent with her claim to be called *Catholic.* The word "Protestant" is not opposed to "Catholic," as some teach, but to popery. Whilst claiming the right to be regarded as Catholic, we may remember the words of Dr. Littledale, who says, "At best the name *Catholic* is not of Divine or apostolic appointment, but of post apostolic human introduction, and, therefore, not inherently sacred."—*Plain Reasons*, p. 249. The Rev. H. C. G. Moule notes that the word Catholic appears first in the writings of Ignatius, early in the second century, and adds—"The first notion of the word was plainly local diffusion. It glided not unnaturally from this to mean also 'orthodox,' as against heretical. . . . It certainly referred to consent about revealed truth more prominently than to uniformity of polity."—*Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, p. 212.

The term "Protestant," originally applied to those who *protested* against the decrees of the Council of Spires, in 1529, and ultimately to all who protested against the errors of Rome, is very imperfectly understood, and is even derided by some who profess to be Churchmen. Bishop Chr. Wordsworth says, "The Church of England became *Protestant* at the Reformation in order that she might be more truly and purely Catholic."—*Theophilus Anglicanus*, p. 177. Dean Hook considers the word applicable to the Church of England, and remarks that "the word Protestant is antagonistic to the word Popish. It was a crafty device to make it stand opposed to the word Catholic." "Protestant is our negative, Catholic our definitive, name. We tell the Papist that with respect to him we are Protestant."—*Church Dictionary.* Dr. Luthardt well says—"Protestantism is not a mere negation. Truly it is a negation—the negation of falsehood setting itself up for Divine truth—the negation of human authority usurping the place of Divine; yet this negation rests upon an affirmation which is its premise, viz., the supreme authority of the Word of God and His truth in matters of faith and salvation." "By Protestant," says Dr. Salmon, "I mean one who has examined into the Roman claims, and has found reason to think them groundless; one who knows that there

are not only great and precious truths on which we agree with the Church of Rome, but also points of difference so grave and fundamental as to justify our remaining in separate communion. If the Church of England be not, in this sense of the word, Protestant, her position cannot be defended at all."—*Infallibility of the Church*, p. 10.

That the Church of England is Protestant is proved by the words of the oath prescribed by 1 Wm. and Mary, stat. i., chap. 6, solemnly taken by our Queen on her coronation. The archbishop addressing her said, "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by law? and will you preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the Churches committed to their charge all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain unto them or any of them?" Answer: "All this I promise to do." Then laying her hand upon the Gospels, she took the oath—"The things which I have before promised, I will perform and keep. So help me God."

English Churchmen cannot well forget the lessons of the past, and so supreme importance must ever be attached to the Protestant succession, which is both a protest and a safeguard against the claims and supremacy of Rome.

Dr. Pusey in a letter, November 22nd, 1865, to the Roman Catholic *Tablet*, on the union of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Churches, says:—"I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were to be explained authoritatively. . . . This involves the conviction that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly as not contradicting anything held to be *de fide* in the Roman Catholic Church." If this be the case, it must be admitted that the Church of England is *not* a Protestant Church. If, however, anyone will study Church history, and compare the Prayer-book of our Church with the Service Books of the Church of Rome, and contrast the Thirty-nine Articles with the Canons of the Council of Trent, he will at once see the utter fallacy of Dr. Pusey's statement.

In further proof that our Church is a Protestant

Church, consider the following points in which she protests against the teaching of the Church of Rome :—

Church of England. (See 39 Articles.)	*Church of Rome.* (See Canons of Council of Trent.)
1. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation (Article VI.)	Anathematises those who refuse to receive the unwritten traditions of the Church.
2. Original sin is the fault and corruption of every man (Article IX.)	Declares the Virgin Mary to have been altogether free from sin.
3. We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not for our own works or deservings (Article XI.)	Teaches that a man is justified by his own inherent righteousness.
4. Works done before justification have the nature of sin as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ (Article XIII.)	Declares the opposite, and anathematises those who hold this view.
5. The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God (Article X.)	Pronounces accursed those who say that the free-will of man was lost after the sin of Adam.
6. The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God (Article XXII.)	Teaches that there is a Purgatory, and that souls there detained are helped by the suffrages and sacrifices of the faithful, enjoins its members to have recourse to saints for help and assistance, and directs that relics be honoured, and images used.

7. It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God and the custom of the Primitive Church to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacrament in a tongue not understanded by the people (Article XXIV.)	Pronounces a curse upon all who say that the Mass ought to be performed only in the vulgar tongue.
8. There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord (Article XXV.)	Pronounces accursed those who say there are more or less than seven Sacraments, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony.
9. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine), in the Supper of our Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions (Article XXVIII.)	Declares that in the Eucharist the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole of Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained, and pronounces accursed those who say they are there only symbolically.
10. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped (Article XXVIII.)	Teaches that the Bread should be adored, and that worship given to it which is due to the true God.
11. The cup of the Lord is not be denied to the lay people (Article XXX.)	Anathematises those who say that every believer ought to receive the Sacrament in both kinds.

12. The offering of Christ once made is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (Article XXXI.)

Decrees that if anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare memorial of the sacrifice which was completed upon the Cross, and that it is not propitiatory nor profitable to any but him that receives it, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and for the dead, for their sins, their punishments, their satisfactions, and their other necessities, let him be accursed.

Every candid student, whatever his views may be, must admit that there is a wide difference between the two Churches. Let the principles of each be honestly tested by Scripture, and we have no fear of the result.

As to her *Government*, the Church of England holds that Christ is her One Great Head. Bishop H. Browne observes that "the very principle of the Reformation may be said to have been that there is no Supreme Head of Christ's Church but Christ Himself." The chief ecclesiastical governor of our Church is the monarch for the time being of these realms. Article XXXVII. *Of the Civil Magistrates* reads thus:—"The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

"Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the injunctions also lately set forth by *Elizabeth* our Queen do most plainly testify, but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given

always to all godly princes in holy Scripture by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

"The Bishop of *Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this realm of *England*. The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars."

The bishops—appointed by those in authority—are the overseers of the Church. With them rests the sole responsibility of selecting fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry. It is their duty to exercise a watchful, wise, and loving oversight over the clergy, and to exercise and enforce authority and discipline agreeably to God's Word, and in conformity with the laws of the land. The form used at the consecration of a bishop, given in the Prayer Book, may be read with profit.

Says Bishop Cosin:—"The office of bishop is not a bare name with us, but a reality. The bishop has to ordain priests and deacons, to institute incumbents, to be the guide of clergy and laity in sacred things, to be active in preaching, to instruct the ignorant, to correct the vicious, to excommunicate the contumacious and grave delinquents, to condemn pertinacious heretics, to suspend, deprive, or degrade indolent, immoral, or disobedient clergymen according to their fault, to make a visitation of his whole diocese every three years, to bring to punishment persons guilty of blasphemy, etc., to confirm young people, to consecrate churches and graveyards, to be zealous in maintaining the rights of the Church, and in promoting temperance, justice, and piety."—*Religion of the Church of England*, 1652.

Our bishops occupy a responsible and difficult position, and need the constant prayers and loyal support of the Church's faithful children.

One of the questions of the day is the *Comprehensiveness* of the Church of England. Some of the clergy are asking for a "tolerant recognition of divergent ritual practice." We cheerfully admit that a Church which calls itself national should be at once liberal, comprehensive, and tolerant. But

comprehension in any society must have its limits. Now the just limits of our Church's comprehensiveness are to be found in her Prayer Book and Articles. She never meant her authorised teachers to approximate to Romanism on the one hand, nor to Socinianism on the other. At the same time a rigid uniformity is not possible, nor is it desirable. But the limits are sufficiently clear. On this point the utterances of the present Bishop of Liverpool, at the Sheffield Church Congress, expressed what we take to be the right view. Bishop—then Canon—Ryle, in a paper on "Comprehensiveness in the National Church," said:—"From the long roll of great divines to which the national Church can thankfully point, let me select a few examples of men of different schools of thought, and then let me ask any thoughtful Churchman whether there is one of them whom he would wish to blackball and exclude from our ranks. Let us think of Ridley, and Latimer, and Jewel; of Hooker, and Andrewes, and Pearson, and Hammond; of Davenant, and Hall, and Usher, and Reynolds; of Stillingfleet, and Patrick, and Waterland, and Bull; of Robert Nelson, and George Herbert; of Romaine, and Toplady, and Newton, and Scott, and Cecil, and Simeon; of Bishop Ryder and Bishop Blomfield; of Archbishops Longley, and Sumner, and Whately; of the martyred Bishop Patteson, and the late Canon Mozley. What reading man does not know that these men differed widely about many subjects—about the Church, the ministry, and the Sacraments—about the meaning of some words and phrases in the Prayer Book—about the relative place, and proportion they assigned to some doctrines and verities of the faith. But they all agreed in loving the Church of England, in thanking God for her Reformation, in maintaining her protest against Rome, in using her forms of worship, and in labouring for her prosperity . . . With all their shades of opinion they were honest Churchmen, and there was room in our pale for all. But are there no *limits to the comprehensiveness* of the Church of England? Order is heaven's first law. A Church must have a creed, and certain fixed principles of doctrine and worship. Its members have a right to know what its ministers are set to teach. A Church which is a mere boneless body like a jelly fish, a colourless, bloodless,

creedless pantheon, in which every one is right who is in earnest, and nobody is wrong, and in which it does not matter a jot what is preached and taught, so long as the preachers are sincere—such a Church is an unpractical absurdity, and the baseless fabric of a dream. . . . The Church which regards Deism, Socinianism, Romanism, and Protestantism, with equal favour, or equal indifference, is a mere Babel, a 'city of confusion,' and not the city of God. I contend that the Church of England has set up wisely-devised limits to its comprehensiveness. These limits, I believe, are to be found in the Creeds, the Articles, and the Book of Common Prayer."—*Church Congress Report*, 1878, pp. 129 and 130.

What are the views of Evangelical Churchmen? In reply we cannot do better than give Bishop E. H. Bickersteth's answer to the question, What are the things which Evangelical Churchmen more prominently hold and teach? The question is an important one, and the answer will, we believe, stand the test of Scripture. It is thus:—

(*a*) The Bible the supreme rule of faith and practice.

(*b*) The quickening of the human soul to spiritual life by the direct operation of the Holy Ghost—a quickening to life, which may, by God's grace, take place before, or in, or after baptism; but of which life baptism is, in those who receive it rightly, the sure witness and effectual seal.

(*c*) Justification by faith only in Jesus Christ crucified and risen.

(*d*) The sustentation of life in the soul's free access to God the Father through Jesus Christ by One Spirit, a life proved by personal holiness, and generally (so God has willed) maintained by prayer, and the study of His Word, and the hearing of His Gospel, and the devout observance of His day, and the faithful reception of the Supper of the Lord. These things we hold in common with other Evangelical Christians; but further—

(*e*) As Churchmen, we yield to none in ardent and filial attachment to that branch of Christ's Church which is established in these realms. We contend that the national acknowledgment of the faith is the first duty of the State. We unfeignedly deplore the prevalence of schism and dissent. We love our Creeds, and Liturgy, and Articles.

We believe the episcopal form of Church government to be most in accordance with the teaching of the New Testament, and we desire cheerfully to obey those set over us in the Lord.

(*f*) Furthermore, we are members of the reformed Church of England. We cannot forget the past. We protest for the pure, unadulterated truth of primitive Catholic Christianity. We protest with our Articles and Homilies against the corruptions of Rome. A very large number of us believe the Church of Rome to be the Babylon of the Apocalypse. But at all events we protest with all our heart against any *concordat* or league with that fallen Church. We are Protestants, and we are not ashamed of the name.

(*g*) And if I might add one thing more, though I thank God that not a few men of other schools vie with us in this with a friendly and generous rivalry, Evangelical Churchmen have certainly during this century been distinguished by a burning love for missionary labours among the heathen. —*Evangelical Churchmanship*, pp. 17 and 18.

We have endeavoured to indicate some of the leading principles of the Church of England. The light in which she regards the Ministry and the Sacraments will be considered in succeeding chapters. We have seen that the history of our Church goes back far beyond the Reformation. She glories in an open Bible, in a reformed faith, in an Apostolic order of ministry, in a primitive liturgy, and in Christ-ordained Sacraments. She is a witness for Christ throughout the world. She claims to be a Catholic Church, a National Church, a Protestant Church, a Comprehensive Church, and a Working Church. We have pointed to the fact that she is assailed by powerful foes from without, and weakened and dishonoured by disloyal members within. A struggle long and severe is before her—she is truly a Militant Church—but, founded on the principles of Evangelical truth, Apostolic order, and Catholic love, she shall not be moved. Truth is mightier than error, and must in the end prevail. Our hope is not in the favour of princes, nor in the voice of the people, but in the Lord of hosts. May it be ours, in the spirit of love, to stand fast in the faith, and

contend earnestly in defence of those principles of truth and liberty which flow from the Gospel, and for which our martyred forefathers laid down their lives. With confidence would we apply to our beloved Church the words of the Psalmist—"God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her and that right early."

"But be true, ye sons and daughters,
Lest the peril be within;
Watch to prayer, lest in your slumber
Stealthy foemen enter in;
Safe the mother and the children
If their will and love be strong,
While their loyal hearts go singing
Prayer and Praise for battle song."

The Christian Ministry.

"Take heed to thyself, and to the doctrine."

THE Church of Christ considered in its visible aspect as a Society in which the Word of God is preached and the Sacraments duly ministered, must of necessity have an order of men to minister in holy things. Pastors and teachers are essential to a scripturally ordered Church.

"It must be evident (says Bishop Lightfoot) that no Society of men could hold together without officers, without rules, without institutions of any kind; and the Church of Christ is not exempt from the universal law . . . As appointed days and set places are indispensable to her efficiency, so also the Church could not fulfil the purposes for which she exists without rulers and teachers, without a ministry of reconciliation, in short, without an order of men who may in some sense be designated a priesthood. . . . The Kingdom of Christ *has no* sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man forgiven."—*Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*—Philippians, pp. 181-2.

Our Lord instituted the Christian ministry when He called and sent forth the twelve Apostles. The great commission was given to them:—"Go ye therefore, and teach—make disciples of—all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt.

xxviii. 19.) As time went on and the Church increased in numbers, other duly qualified persons were set apart for the ministry and work of the Church. Deacons were appointed (Acts vi. 1—5); elders or presbyters were "ordained in every Church" (Acts xiv. 23); whilst the qualifications of a bishop or overseer are given in 1 Tim. ii. 1—7. St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says (2 Tim. ii. 2), "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." The great design of the Christian ministry is set forth in Eph. iv. 11—13, "And He gave some *to be* apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ; till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God."

The grand and ultimate aim of the ministry is then, the ingathering of God's people into the fold of Christ, the edification, uniting, and completing of the Church of God. In the New Testament ministers are designated ambassadors, shepherds, stewards, builders, labourers, but—and it is important to note this—nowhere are they called priests, except in common with *all* believers (Rev. i. 6; xx. 6.)

Looking at the nature and responsibilities of his office, the faithful minister of Christ may well exclaim—"Who is sufficient for these things?" How needful to remember the words of one of the Church's greatest preachers—"As we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts." (1 Thess. ii. 4.)

The light in which the Church of England regards the ministry will be seen by a reference to the Ordination Services, and Articles XXIII., XXXII., and XXXVI. In the preface to the Ordination Services she defines her position in relation to the three Orders of the Ministry, thus:—

"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices

were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination."

Bishop Barry says respecting the historical assertion on which the Church of England bases her rule :—"Such assertion is absolutely unquestioned as regards priests and deacons. The Episcopate alone has been questioned; and even here the question is confined within narrow limits. For, first it is perfectly certain that the name 'Bishop' (or Overseer) is, in the New Testament, attached as a descriptive title to the office of Presbyter (see Acts xx. 17, 28; Titus i. 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 7); and hence it is evident that the Episcopal order did not appear as a fully developed and distinct order so long as the Apostolate remained. Next, it is equally certain that from the middle of the second century onwards, the distinctive existence of the Episcopate, as the highest order in the ministry, was universally recognised in every portion of the Church, and even in the heretical sects seceding from it."—*Teacher's Prayer Book.*

Much has been said concerning the doctrine of Apostolical succession—a phrase used to denote one or both of *two* things—the derivation of holy orders by an unbroken chain of transmission from the apostles, and the succession of a ministry so ordained to the powers and privileges of the apostles. This doctrine was continually put forward and emphasized by the writers of "Tracts for the Times." Tract 4, written by John Keble, says—"Why should we talk so much of our 'establishment,' and so little of an 'Apostolical succession?' Why should we not seriously endeavour to impress our people with the plain truth—that by separating

themselves from our Communion, they separate themselves, —not only from a decent, orderly, useful society, but from the only Church in this realm which has a right to be quite sure that she has the Lord's Body to give to the people?"

Dr. Hook, in his "Church Dictionary," writes:—"The Apostolical succession of the ministry is essential to the right administration of the Holy Sacraments. The clergy of the Church of England can trace their connection with the Apostles by links, not one of which is wanting from the times of St. Paul and St. Peter to our own." Said the late Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, "The bishops of the Church of England are by unbroken succession the descendants and representatives of the original twelve." Dean Goulburn, whilst admitting that there have been many great saints and great teachers outside such line, declares, "There is and can be no real and true Church apart from the one Society which the Apostles founded, *and which has been propagated only in the line of the Episcopal succession. There is no regular authority or right for the Ministry whatsoever, but only in this one line.*"—*Holy Catholic Church*, 2nd Ed., p. 83, 84.*

What Scriptural authority is there for statements such as these? We regard it as a misfortune that so much importance should be attached to this theory of Apostolic succession. To affirm that it is essential to the existence of a true Church, as some have done, is to declare that all Churches not under Episcopal rule are really not Churches at all. Such a theory puts thousands of godly preachers, missionaries, and teachers outside the pale of the Church of Christ. He must be a bold man who would say that preachers such as John Bunyan, Richard Howe, John Owen, Matthew Henry, Robert Hall, Morley Punshon; and missionaries such as William Carey, John Williams, Robert Morrison, David Livingstone, and Robert Moffat were not

---

* Since this chapter was written, the theory has been more moderately stated in a High Church Review, thus:—"Stript of technicalities and put into everyday language, all that Apostolical succession means is that the same rule holds good in the Christian Church as in every well-ordered secular Government, viz.: that officers cannot appoint themselves, but must derive their commission from the supreme central authority, or from some person empowered thereby."—*Church Quarterly.*

ministers of Christ. And yet none of these received Episcopal ordination. Surely we as Churchmen have no right to say to the Nonconformist, "You have no part in Christ; you are not a member of His Church; you are only a member of an earthly Society; your Sacraments are nought; you are no better off than the heathen; nay, worse, because you have rejected privileges which have never been offered them."

No, with history before us and an open Bible in our hand, we cannot accept a theory which involves consequences such as these.*

All duly appointed ministers who live holy lives and preach apostolic truth are, in a very true sense, successors of the apostles.

Men seek to bolster up their sacerdotal claims by boasting of an historical apostolical succession, for which no proof can be given. It is uncertain whether Peter, whom some suppose to have been the first Bishop of Rome, ever saw that city. As to the second Bishop of that See, some say he was Clement, and others Linus; and as to the third Bishop of Rome there is more uncertainty still. Archbishop Whately says, "There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty his own spiritual pedigree." —*Kingdom of Christ*, p. 175.

The late thoughtful and learned Frederick Myers writes: "This assertion that there is and needs be on earth an unbroken succession of ministers, who have continuously received and transmitted an invisible latent gift of grace, is one which not only has no proof, but cannot have any."— *Catholic Thoughts*, 102.

Archdeacon Hare speaks out very plainly on this theory of apostolical succession thus:—"This monstrous error, which would restrict the power of Christ's mediatorial sacrifice and the efficacy of His Sacraments within the limits of Episcopal Churches is still confined, I trust, in the main, to some of our weaker brethren, who, in the want of logical

* In the Litany, we rightly pray to be delivered from *schism*. "From all false doctrine, heresy, and schism, good Lord deliver us." Schism in any Church is much to be deplored and guarded against. But what is a schismatic? "One who produces division in a Church without any justifiable cause." It would be unjust to say that all who do not conform to our Church are schismatics

and plastic power, stake themselves up with positive peremptory assertions."—*Mission of the Comforter.*

We have dwelt somewhat fully on this subject of apostolical succession, because we believe it forms the foundation of much of the priestly assumption and Romish teaching of the present day. There are, as Archbishop Whately has observed, persons who neglect to exercise their mental powers to whom the notion is very captivating and seductive. "There is something imposing in the idea of the 'Sacramental character of Ordination,' conferred by persons who have derived a mystical virtue from the successive imposition of hands up to the times of the apostles; and, of the 'priestly' or 'sacerdotal' character thus imparted, and the 'sacrifices' offered at an 'altar';—of a primitive doctrine always to be found somewhere in the Catholic traditions, etc. . . . Successors in the apostolic office, the apostles have none. As *personal attendants* on the Lord Jesus, and *witnesses* of His *resurrection*, as *dispensers* of *miraculous* gifts, as inspired *oracles* of Divine *revelation*, they have no successors. But as *members*, as *ministers*, as *governors*, their successors are the regularly admitted members—the lawfully ordained ministers—the regular and recognised governors of a regularly subsisting Christian Church; especially of a Church which, conforming in fundamentals—as I am persuaded ours does—to Gospel principles, claims and exercises no rights beyond those which have the clear sanction of our great Master, as being essentially implied in the very character of a community."—*Kingdom of Christ*, pp. 205, 222.

We know little of the government of the early Church. Much that has been written upon it is mere conjecture. We venture to affirm that the New Testament nowhere lays down any one particular form of Church government as essential and indispensable. "Let all things be done decently and in order." "Let all things be done unto edifying." These are the apostolic rules. In the New Testament the words *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are synonymous and convertible terms. It is, however, an historical fact that one hundred years after the Apostolic age, there existed in the Christian Church the threefold order of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The Church of England has

declared in favour of this order, which she pronounces to be primitive and apostolical. Ever since 1662 she has absolutely required episcopal ordination for her ministers. As to other differently constituted Churches she is silent.

It has been observed that Article XXIII., "Of Ministering in the Congregation," is so general in its terms, that it might be admitted by any body of Christians who maintain the principle of an order of ministers set apart for the service of the Church. It reads thus :—

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

The solemn nature and weighty responsibilities of the Christian ministry are clearly set forth in our Ordination Services. Well would it be if such Services were more frequently read by the laity.

After private examination as to character and fitness for the ministry, the candidates for priests' orders are thus reminded by the Bishop of the solemn nature of the office they seek :—

"You have heard, Brethren, as well in your private examination, as in the exhortation which was now made to you, and in the holy Lessons taken out of the Gospel, and the writings of the Apostles, of what dignity, and of how great importance this Office is, whereunto ye are called. And now again, we exhort you, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you have in remembrance, into how high a Dignity, and to how weighty an Office and Charge ye are called ; that is to say, to be Messengers, Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord ; to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family ; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever. Have always therefore printed in your remembrance, how great a treasure is committed to your charge," etc.

The following searching questions are then put concerning the call, the rule of faith and practice, the individual life, and the submission to the rulers of the Church:—

"*The Bishop.*—Do you think in your heart, that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of *England*, to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood?

"*Answer.*—I think it.

"*The Bishop.*—Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

"*Answer.*—I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your Cure and Charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same.

"*Answer.*—I will so do, by the help of the Lord.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word; and to use both publick and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your Cures, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given?

"*Answer.*—I will, the Lord being my helper.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you be diligent in Prayers, and in reading of the holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?

"*Answer.*—I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you be diligent to frame and fashion your own selves, and your families, according to the Doctrine of Christ; and to make both yourselves and them, as much

as in you lieth, wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ?

"*Answer.*—I will apply myself thereto, the Lord being my helper.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you maintain and set forward, as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?

"*Answer.*—I will so do, the Lord being my helper.

"*The Bishop.*—Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?

"*Answer.*—I will so do, the Lord being my helper."

The bishop then prays that those about to be ordained may have "strength and power" granted to perform that which they have promised, after which all join in singing the "Veni Creator."

> "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
> And lighten with celestial fire.
> Thou the anointing Spirit art,
> Who dost Thy seven-fold gifts impart."

Next follows the Ordination, the priests present joining with the bishop in the laying on of hands. The words used by the bishop are based on John xx., 22, 23, and 1 Cor. iv., 1, 2. "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

The bishop then delivers a Bible to each, saying, "Take thou Authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."

It may be noted that in this Ordination Service, as in Article XIX, the preaching of God's Word is put as the first

duty of the Christian ministry; the administration of the Sacraments occupies the second place.

The ages of Ordination are 23 years for a deacon and 24 years for a priest, and were fixed by the 30th Canon of 1604. No one can be consecrated a bishop unless he be fully 30 years of age. Every man who presents himself for admission into the ministry of the Church of England is supposed to have been inwardly called by the Holy Spirit. No matter what his other talents and attainments may be, if this great essential be lacking, no form of ordination, however solemn and scriptural, can make him a *true* minister of the Gospel. How intensely searching and solemn the question put by the bishop, in the presence of the congregation, to each ordained deacon:—"Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration, to serve God for the promoting of His glory, and the edifying of His people?"—and terribly solemn the consequences if the answer, "I trust so," be not sincere.

Here may be given a short epitome of the legal requirements from the clergy of the Church of England.

Before a person can be ordained deacon there must be furnished:—(1) Certificate of baptism; (2) Theological certificate from College; (3) College testimonials; (4) *Si Quis*, or notice publicly read in the Church of the place where the candidate resides, to the effect that "if any person knows any cause or just impediment why the candidate ought not to be admitted into Holy Orders, he is to declare the same," etc.; (5) Letters testimonial, signed by three beneficed clergymen who have known the candidate a number of years (usually two *or* three), certifying that during that period he has lived "piously, soberly, and honestly," that he has not "maintained, said, or written anything contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England," and that he is "as to his moral conduct a fit person to be admitted to the sacred ministry" [or sacred order of priests]; (6) Nomination to a curacy.

After Ordination, the minister receives a "Letter of Orders" from his bishop, certifying that on such a day was admitted "A. B., of ——— College, of whose virtuous and pious life and conversation, and competent learning and

knowledge in the Holy Scriptures, we were well assured into the holy Order of Deacons" (or Priests).

The first Sabbath on which the newly ordained minister officiates he must make a declaration before the congregation :—"I, A. B., clerk, do solemnly make the following declaration : I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the united Church of England and Ireland, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

In addition to the foregoing, he must take the Oath of Canonical Obedience to his bishop :—"I, A. B., do swear that I will pay true and canonical obedience to the Lord Bishop of———and his successors in all things lawful and honest. So help me God." Also the Oath of Allegiance :—"I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God."

Besides the above, a newly appointed incumbent is required to make a declaration against Simony. He must also read before the congregation on the first Sabbath on which he officiates, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and declare his assent to the same, and to the Book of Common Prayer. When all this has been done, the bishop grants authority to the new incumbent, "in preaching the Word of God, and in reading the Common Prayers, and performing all other ecclesiastical duties belonging to the said office."

Simony is the offence of buying or selling ecclesiastical preferment, and is so named from Simon Magus, who thought to purchase the gift of the Holy Ghost with money (Acts vii.)

It will thus be seen that the ministry of the Church of England is hedged in by safeguards. The bishop is the sole judge as to the candidate's moral and personal qualifications, yet, notwithstanding every precaution, it sometimes happens that those who are unworthy have authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments (Article XXVI.) We must not be surprised at this. If a Judas found a place

among the twelve apostles, is it any wonder there should be false and unfaithful brethren among the 24,000 clergy of the Church of England?

Ministers of the Church of England are not to be looked upon as State officers, a sort of spiritual police, whose duties are simply to preach, visit, baptize, marry, bury, and keep order in their parishes, for which work they are paid by the State. Nor are they to be regarded as members of a sacrificing priesthood, empowered to reproduce and offer the sacrifice of Christ and absolve from sin. The teaching of the Church of Rome in this latter respect has, unhappily, many followers in the Church of England. Hence it is needful to protest against it, and show its unscriptural character, and the hollowness of its claims. Not a few of our clergy claim to be sacrificing priests, and pretend to exercise the power of absolution, asserting that the ritual of the Jewish Church is in the main the divine model for Christian worship.

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett (Vicar of Frome), when examined before the Ritual Commission, gave the following answers to the questions put to him :—"Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?—Yes. In fact, *sacerdos*, a sacrificing priest?—Distinctly so. Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice.—Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice."

The *Directorium Anglicanum*—already named—an elaborate manual, intended for the use of Ritualistic clergy, says—"The Catholic priest, who knows that the action is done in the Person of Christ, who knows his office to be to perpetuate on the altars of the Church Militant on earth the same sacrifice which the Great High Priest consummated once on the Cross, and perpetuates, not repeats, before the Mercy-seat, in Heaven, will reverently handle such tremendous mysteries, will be greatly careful that no dishonour be thoughtlessly done unto his Lord, WHO vouchsafes to be present on our altars."—Preface, p. ix.

The Rev. M. F. Sadler, writing on the Christian priesthood, concludes one of his lectures thus—"It is clear, then, that not only were there ministers delegated by Christ Himself, to exercise the highest sacerdotal functions, but also that provision was made that the exercise of those functions should be perpetual."—*Church Doctrine*, p. 238.

The Rev. J. H. Blunt, in his "Key to Church History" (ancient), says (pp. 3, 4)—"When our Blessed Lord came 'to fulfil the law,' this Jewish ritual was, in a great measure, engrafted into the worship of the Christian Church. The 'singers arrayed in white' became the white-robed choirs of the Christian Church, and the threefold order of the Christian ministry represented the high priests, priests and Levites of the old dispensation."

What must be our answer to teaching such as this? We are told that the Church of England claims the power of absolution for her ministers, and for proof are pointed to the bishop's words in the Ordination Service—"Receive the Holy Ghost, etc. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." The forms of absolution are also indicated, especially that in the "Visitation of the Sick."

But "What saith the Scriptures?" Our Church declares them to be the final court of appeal. We venture to say that nowhere does the New Testament give the slightest countenance to any priestly system or sacerdotal claim. If it declares anything plainly, it is the fact that the Christian ministry is not a sacrificing priesthood. In no single passage is a teacher under the Christian dispensation called a priest. He is a steward of the mysteries of God, an ambassador, a pastor, a teacher, but not a priest. The apostles boasted in the designation "servant,"—"your servants for Jesus' sake."

Nor can we sanction the view that the Jewish ritual is to be the model for Christian worship. How strange that in the full light of the Gospel day there should be those who, like the Galatians of old, desire to turn to the weak and beggarly elements of Jewish ritual (Gal. iv. 9). But the Scriptures cannot be broken. The Epistle to the Hebrews clearly shows that the first covenant, with its ordinances of Divine worship, its sacrifices and its priesthood, was for a season only. In God's time these were doomed to "vanish away." They were imposed by God until the time of reformation. Christ the High Priest of good things has brought in a "new and better covenant," and the "yoke of bondage" which consisted of a wearisome externalism which did not cleanse the conscience, has given way to an "easy

yoke and a light burden" (Matt. xi. 29; Heb. ix. 9-14). The Old Covenant, with its priests and sacrifices, received its fulfilment in Christ, who offered once for all, one sacrifice for sin, and who hath "an unchangeable priesthood."

Says Bishop Perowne, "Surely nothing is more striking than the absolute opposition between the Old Testament and the New in this respect. The whole of the Old Testament, the whole of the law and the ministry under the law, may be described as a vast apparatus of priestly mediation. All access to God is through the priest. The priest offers the sacrifices which are to put away guilt; the priest makes atonement; the priest intercedes; the priest absolves; the priest blesses. In the New Testament all this has vanished. The ministry of a human priesthood disappears, because all Christians are priests in and through the One Eternal Priest, who has put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."—*Sermon on the Ministry.*

Dean Alford in his Greek Testament, on the words, "Go shew thyself to the priest" (Matt. viii. 4), remarks that the command has been used in support of the theory of satisfaction by priestly confession and penance, and adds, "the Levitical priests were types not of future human priests, but of Him who remaineth a priest for ever, in an unchangeable priesthood, and in whom not a class of Christians, but *all* Christians are priests unto God."

We hold, then, that the drawing of parallels between the Jewish priesthood and the Christian ministry is wrong in principle, and opposed to the spirit and letter of the Gospel. "God taketh away the first, that He may establish the second" (Heb. x. 9.)

But it may be urged that the word priest is common to the Prayer Book, and the Ordination Services. Granted; but the question is, what does the word mean? Etymologically, it is identical with "presbyter," or "elder." It comes from the Greek word—πρεσβύτερος—a word of very frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and invariably translated *elder*. This word, in its Latinized form, passed into French, and became shortened into priest. Hence Milton says, "New Presbyter is but old priest, writ large." In this sense, every Christian minister is a priest. We find in the Prayer Book "priest" and "minister" used, as though

they described the same person, *e.g.*, in the Morning Service: "The *Minister*, clerks, and people, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with a loud voice. Then the *Priest*, standing up, shall say."

On this point, the words of Bishop Perowne are unquestionably true:—"The only order associated with bishops and deacons in the New Testament, and in ancient authors, is the order of presbyters. It is, therefore, indisputable that our Church uses Priest as the equivalent of Presbyter, in her Ordination Service; and if in her Ordination Service, then everywhere else."

If further confirmation of this view be needed, we have it in the pages of the judicious Hooker, who says—"Whether we call the ministry a priesthood, or presbytership, or a ministry, it skilleth not, although, in truth, the word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech, more agreeable than *priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Holy Ghost, throughout the body of the New Testament, making so much mention of them, doth not anywhere, call them priests"—*Eccl. Polity*, Book v., c. 78. s. 2.

Canon Farrar, in his admirable notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews, says on xiii. 10—"The Christian priest is only a presbyter, not a sacrificing priest. He is only a sacrificing priest in exactly the same sense as every Christian is metaphorically so called, because *alike* presbyter and people offer '*spiritual* sacrifices,' which are alone acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter ii. 5.)

There is, then, abundant proof that the Gospel ministry is not in any sense a sacrificing priesthood. No man is delegated to stand between God and man in a sacerdotal capacity. Christ Himself is the one, the only, and the all-sufficient priest. We need no other, for His sacrifice is perfect and complete. He ever liveth to make intercession for us. The name priest is never once applied in the New Testament to the Gospel ministry. Consequently the Church of England declares, by her Sixth Article, that she does not require her members to believe that her ministers are sacrificing priests, or that they have power to forgive sin.

But it may be said, What then do the words of the Ordination Service signify, "Whose sins thou dost forgive they

are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained ? " By referring to John xx. 22, 23, it will be seen that these words were used by the risen Lord to His apostles. The famous passage concerning the power of the keys spoken by our Lord to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19) ; also similar words spoken to all the disciples (Matt. xviii. 18), may be read in connection with the verses from St. John.

What power is conferred upon clergy at Ordination ? What do the words used signify ? The figure of binding and loosing—remitting and retaining—is common in Jewish writings, and signified "not the power of remitting or retaining sin (in its proper sense), but the power of *declaring* what was lawful or unlawful under the law."

It is important to notice that the power of remitting sin, etc., is given, not to the apostles alone, but to *all* the disciples of our Lord then present—" the eleven, and they that were with them " (Luke xxiv. 33). Hence, as Professor Westcott observes :—"The commission therefore must be regarded properly as the commission of the Christian Society, and not as that of the Christian Ministry."—*Commentary on St. John.*

An example as to how the early Church exercised the power of binding and loosing—bidding and forbidding—may be seen in the decision of the first Church Council (Acts xv.) St. Peter exercised the power of the keys when on the day of Pentecost he admitted three thousand souls into the Christian Church, and afterwards the household of Cornelius ; also when he sealed the destinies of Ananias and Sapphira. In the first case the apostle *admitted* into the kingdom of God, in the other he *excluded.*

On this important matter the words of Dean Vaughan are clear and convincing. Quoting the words spoken by our Lord to St. Peter, and the passage from St. John's Gospel contained in our Ordination Service, the Dean writes :—" Is the power of forgiving sins in the name and by the authority of Christ committed to any human mind or voice ? Did Jesus Christ commit to His first apostles, or to any who should come after them in the ministerial office, the power to absolve men from their sins, or to refuse to do so ? . . . The authority conveyed to St. Peter to bind and to loose has sometimes been conceived to refer to the retention or

remission of sins ; to the setting men loose from, or retaining upon them the guilt of their past transgressions. How strange a perversion of the simple meaning of the original ! To bind and to loose are, in Jewish language, to forbid and to permit. The promise that what the apostles bound or loosed on earth should be bound or loosed in heaven, is the promise that what they forbade as contrary to their Master's will, should be forbidden with the authority of God, and what they permitted or sanctioned as according to their Master's will, should be permitted or sanctioned with the authority of God. . . . . Now whatever variety there may have been in the interpretation of the words, John xx. 22, 23, no one will suppose them to mean that the Apostles or any other men were to have the power of forgiving sins, or refusing forgiveness, arbitrarily, by rules of their own, or by no rules. No human being could have authority to do more than declare forgiveness, and that by God's sentence, not his own. . . . . The apostles were enabled, in certain cases, to judge infallibly whether a particular person was sincere or insincere, *e.g.*, that of Simon Magus (Acts viii. 21-23). But far more often, even in the case of the apostles, the remitting or retaining of sins was general. They declared to their hearers the remission of sins, on the conditions of repentance and faith, the retention of sins in the absence of this mind. Without exercising an individual insight which would have been commonly unprofitable or injurious, they proclaimed the terms of forgiveness, and urged men to fulfil them. . . . It is, doubtless, in this latter sense, the general declaration, rather than the individual appropriation of the Divine promise of forgiveness, that these words are still used in our Service for the Ordination of Priests, 'Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.' . . . The Church of England knows of no priesthood to interpose between the soul of man and God : the Church of England knows but of one Priest, and He is our Great High Priest, passed already through the heavens (Heb. iv. 14.)"—*Liturgy and Worship of the Church of England.* 2nd Edition, pp. 79-91

Dean Goulburn, writing on the same subject, says :—"Without entering into particulars about the meaning of the words 'remitting' and 'retaining' sins, let us take them

in that broad and incontrovertible sense in which the soundest divines of our Church (Barrow, for instance, and many others), have understood and expounded them, and which the charge which follows them in the sentence of Ordination (to be 'faithful in dispensing God's Word and Sacraments') seems to impose upon them. So understood and explained, they mean almost, if not quite, the same as the 'binding and loosing' of which we have spoken already. The ministry of the Gospel is a ministry of reconciliation. The great message of God's Word is, 'We pray you in Christ's stead be *ye reconciled* to God.' The one Baptism is for the "*remission of sins.*' The Holy Supper represents and conveys Christ's 'blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the *remission of sins.*'"—*Holy Catholic Church*, pp. 148, 149.

Dean Alford, in his Greek Testament, has this note on John xx. 23. "The apostles had this—the gift of discernment of sin and repentance in others—in an especial manner, and by the full indwelling of the Spirit, were enabled to discern the hearts of men, and to give sentence on that discernment. See Acts v. 1—11; viii. 21; xiii. 9. And this gift belongs to the Church in all ages, and especially to those who by legitimate appointment are set to minister in the Churches of Christ: not *by successive delegation* from the apostles—*of which fiction I find in the New Testament no trace*—but by their mission from Christ, the bestower of the Spirit for their office, when *orderly and legitimately conferred upon them by the various Churches.*"

Bishop Lightfoot, after tracing the growth of sacerdotalism in the Christian Church, says:—"The progress of the *sacerdotal* view of the ministry is one of the most striking and important phenomena in the history of the Church" (p. 244). "It is to Gentile feeling that this development must be ascribed. For the heathen, familiar with auguries, lustrations, sacrifices, and depending on the intervention of some priest for all the manifold religious rites of the State, the club, and the family, the sacerdotal functions must have occupied a far larger space in the affairs of every-day life than for the Jew of the Dispersion, etc. It is a significant fact that the first instance of the term 'priest,' applied to a Christian minister, occurs in a heathen writer—Lucian" (pp.

261, 262). "The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of Christian sacrifices, of a Christian altar; but the sacrifices are praise and thanksgiving, and well-doing; the altar is apparently the cross of Christ. If the Christian ministry were a sacerdotal office, if the holy Eucharist were a sacerdotal act, in the same sense in which the Jewish priesthood, and the Jewish sacrifices were sacerdotal, then his argument is faulty, and his language misleading. Though dwelling at great length on the Christian counterparts to the Jewish priest, the Jewish altar, the Jewish sacrifice, he omits to mention the one office, the one place, the one act, which on this showing would be the truest and liveliest counterparts in the every-day worship of the Church of Christ. He has rejected these, and he has chosen instead moral and spiritual analogies for all these sacred types. Thus, in what he has said, and what he has left unsaid alike, his language points to one and the same result. If, therefore, the sacerdotal office be understood to imply the offering of sacrifices, then the Epistle to the Hebrews leaves no place for a Christian priesthood. If, on the other hand, the word be taken on a wider and looser acceptation, it cannot well be withheld from the ministry of the Church of Christ. Only in this case the meaning of the term should be clearly apprehended; and it might have been better if the later Christian vocabulary had conformed to the silence of the apostolic writers, so that the possibility of confusion would have been avoided. According to this broader meaning, the priest may be defined as one who represents God to man, and man to God. It is, moreover, indispensable that he should be called by God, for no man 'taketh this honour to himself.' The Christian ministry satisfies both these conditions."—*Dissertation on the Christian Ministry*. pp. 265, 266. Philippians.

We conclude then that the ministry of the Church of England is not a priesthood in any proper sense of the word. We have no sacrifice to offer save that of service, praise, and thanksgiving. We have no power to forgive sin. We are authorised to declare that God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent. Beyond this we have no authority. We protest against the teaching that men are dependent upon a "priesthood" for a bestowal of divine

grace, or that "God under the Gospel has interposed human media between His grace and the soul." We are not mediators between God and the individual soul, nor are we priests commissioned to offer propitiatory sacrifice and pronounce special absolution, but messengers sent forth to make known to men the Gospel of the grace of God. If any class of men pretend to stand between man and God, saying, "Only through us—the Church—can you approach God; only through my consecrated touch can you receive grace; only through my ordained teaching can you hear God's voice," such are blind leaders and false teachers. The Christian ministry is altogether different from the Mosaic priesthood, for, to repeat the important words of Bishop Lightfoot, "THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST HAS NO SACERDOTAL SYSTEM. IT INTERPOSES NO SACRIFICIAL TRIBE OR CLASS BETWEEN GOD AND MAN BY WHOSE INTERVENTION ALONE GOD IS RECONCILED AND MAN FORGIVEN." It is our work to preach the everlasting Gospel in all its gracious fulness and loving simplicity; to minister the Sacraments according to Christ's ordinance, without admixture of human error; and to proclaim peace and goodwill to men. We are ministers—that is servants—not lords over God's heritage. "We preach Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Faithful servants and sympathetic friends. *Servus servorum Dei*—servant of the servants of God; *Amicus amicorum Dei*—friend of the friends of God, will ever be the high and honourable titles of every true-hearted Christian minister.

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast purchased to Thyself an universal Church by the precious blood of Thy dear Son; mercifully look upon the same, and so guide and govern the minds of Thy servants the bishops and pastors of Thy flock, that they may lay hands suddenly on no man, but faithfully and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of Thy Church. And to those which shall be ordained to any holy function give Thy grace and heavenly benediction; that both by their life and doctrine they may set forth Thy glory, and set forward the salvation of all men; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The Sacraments.

"Ye shall keep Mine Ordinances."

THE Sacraments are visible signs and seals of the Gospel Covenant. They are holy symbols—legacies of love—which meet the needs of human nature, and by which faith is strengthened and the Christian religion manifested. The Sacraments hold an important place in the Church of God. Whilst some would over-estimate their nature and effects, turning Christian ordinances into what borders on superstitious and merely formal ceremonies, let us be careful not to undervalue their significance and blessing. "Who is so strong in faith that he can dispense with the external support, the visible pledges with which the Lord Himself meets our weakness? What kind of faith is that which thinks it can do without the proper ordinances of the Lord? Who is the singular person who thinks himself so intimately joined to the Lord and the invisible Church that he can do without the visible bond of union?"—*Martensen.* St. Augustine says :—"In no name of religion, true or false, can men be assembled unless united by some common use of visible signs or Sacraments."—*Aug. v. Faustum.* Book ix., c. 11.

Sacraments or visible symbols are needed then to meet the necessities of the soul of man. It was so with the Jews in the Old Dispensation. They had the divine institutions of the Circumcision and the Passover. On the advent of

Christ these were supplanted by the higher Ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—the one the emblem of purification, the sacrament of initiation; the other a memorial of the atonement, a pledge of faith and unity.

There is much confused and erroneous teaching at the present day as to the number, nature, and effects of the Sacraments. Never was it more needful to have clear and Scriptural views on this great subject. The warning words of that deep thinker, Edward Irving, are undoubtedly true, and may be quoted here without any apology. He writes:—"For want of solemn declaration of the truth concerning the Sacraments, and for want of care to exhibit the distinctions of the visible Church from the world, innumerable errors have sprung up amongst us, and the Sacraments have come to be regarded as having in themselves a mysterious virtue to take away our sins. The Sacrament of Baptism on the one hand is regarded as equivalent to regeneration, or the new birth. That is, the birth of the Spirit is made to inhere in an outward sign, and can at any time be brought to anyone at the bidding of a regularly ordained minister of the Church; after which, Confirmation strengthens the infant life of the soul; after which, the Sacrament [of the Lord's Supper] seals it; and being from time to time regularly partaken of, the work of our salvation is completed and done. Such is the practical faith of thousands amongst us; to overthrow which the short and easy method is simply to declare that without living faith, these Sacraments are not only no benefit, but a great evil to the soul."—*Idolatry of the Sacraments.*

The name Sacrament is not found in the Bible. It is an ecclesiastical term, and began to be used by Christian writers early in the second century. The word Sacrament, in its broad sense, signifies anything sacred, and is derived from the Latin *Sacramêntum*, a word commonly used of the oath which a Roman soldier took to be faithful and obedient. The term is restricted by Protestant Churches to the two Divinely appointed institutions of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

In early times the word was used in a much wider sense. This is illustrated by the "Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments," thus:—"In a general acceptation the name

of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby a holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven Sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like. . . . And, although there are retained by the order of the Church of England besides these two (Baptism and the Lord's Supper), certain other rites and ceremonies (Matrimony, Confirmation, etc.), yet no man ought to take these for Sacraments in such signification and meaning as the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are."

Let us now turn to the Church Catechism, in which our Church defines a Sacrament, and limits the application of the word to the means of grace appointed by Christ Himself.

"*Question.*—How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?

"*Answer.*—Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

"*Question.*—What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament?*

"*Answer.*—I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

"*Question.*—How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

"*Answer.*—Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

With the Catechism read Article XXV. *Of the Sacraments*:—

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him.

"There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme

Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

"The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint *Paul* saith."

The word *sign* which occurs both in the Catechism and Article may be defined in the ancient words of St. Augustine, thus:—"A sign is a thing which, beside the impression it makes on the senses of itself, suggests the thought of something else to the mind." The Latin word (*signum*) was often used for a *seal*. In early times the impress of a person's seal was equal in effect to his signature. In law at the present day, the signing and sealing of a document ratifies a bargain previously arranged. Hence on signing a document the person says, "I deliver this as my act and deed." This ratifies or confirms the transaction. And this sense of the word seems to be that of our Article. Sacraments are declared to be "certain sure witnessess, and effectual *signs* of grace." Baptism is "as an *instrument*" whereby the promises "are visibly *signed* and *sealed*."—(Compare Romans iv. 11).

It will be seen from the passages cited that the Church of England, by her Catechism, Articles, and Homily makes a clear and consistent declaration. She differs greatly from the Church of Rome as to the number, nature, and effects of the Sacraments. The latter, following the dogmatic teaching of the schoolmen of the middle ages, lays down the principle that the Sacraments are by their own nature channels of grace, so that *ex opere operato*, from the mere fact of their administration, and irrespective of the disposition of the recipient, they convey grace to the soul. The authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome on the Sacraments is set forth in the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, and the decrees of the Council of Trent, thus:—"I profess that

there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the New Law instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not necessary for all, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace."—*Creed of Pope Pius, Art. III.*

"If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Covenant do not contain the grace which they signify, or do not confer the grace itself on those not placing a bar, etc., let him be accursed." "If any one shall say that grace is not conferred by those Sacraments of the New Covenant, *ex opere operato*, but that faith in the Divine promise alone suffices to obtain grace, let him be accursed."—*Council of Trent, Sess.* vii., *Canons* 6, 8.

Such a theory as this held by the Church of Rome is contrary to Scripture, and opposed to the teaching of the Church of England, which declares, with no uncertain sound, that the Sacraments benefit "*such only as worthily receive the same*," for "without faith it is impossible to please God." The Sacraments confer grace only when *rightly received*, and not merely by virtue of their administration.

Hence Bishop Jeremy Taylor says—"Neither the external act, nor the internal grace and morality does affect our pardon and salvation; but the Spirit of God, who blesses the symbols, and assists the duty, makes them holy, and this acceptable."—*Worthy Communicant.*

Dr. Wm. Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, 1580—1595, says—"We do not deny that Sacraments do, in their measure, work grace as means and instruments, but inasmuch as they—the papists—bind grace to the Sacraments, and include it in the Sacraments, as if they brought grace of themselves, we cannot approve of their views . . . We say that the Sacraments were instituted, not that they should impart faith, but that they should confirm the faith *before imparted*, in its hold upon the promises, and seal the same promises to us; and we say that the force of the Sacraments is this, that the Sacraments confer no grace on those who do not believe the promises, but on those who believe them, the greatest."—*Prælectiones de Sacramentis.*

Hooker, on the same subject, says—"Grace is a *consequent*

of Sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end—a benefit which they have received from God Himself, the Author of Sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them. They are not physical, but moral duties of service and worship, which, unless we perform as the Author of Grace requireth, they are unprofitable, *for all receive not the grace of God, which receive the Sacraments of His grace.** . . . . We take not Baptism, nor the Eucharist, for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies, assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity), for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the Sacraments, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the Sacraments represent or signify."—*Ecclesiastical Polity.* Book v., c. 57, ss. 4, 5.

The Sacraments, then, are symbols—"holy mysteries, seals," instituted and ordained by Christ, and designed to assist the operation, and to help the weaknesses of our faith, and to assure us of His love. They were not ordained to be gazed upon. "They are not to be seen, but to be *seen through*." They rest on the express institution and command of Christ Himself. To neglect and despise them, is to disobey and dishonour our blessed Lord. Let us be careful not to dishonour them by superstition on the one hand, nor by unbelief on the other. They are holy pledges of God's love to man. The use is ours, the effect is God's. Owing to the imperfect state of things on earth, unworthy persons may at times have the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, but as Article XXVI. declares—"Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such *as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments.*"

"The administration and reception of the Sacraments is

---

* So St. Augustine, speaking of the Lord's Supper, says—"We also this day receive visible food, but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another."—*Hom.* 26. Also Calvin, who in his works shows how great and deadly the error to imagine that Sacraments justify and confer grace, provided only we do not interpose to them the bar of mortal sin. "What," he asks, "is a Sacrament without faith?" —*Institutes,* Book iv., c. 14, s. 14.

necessary, because it hath pleased God in His infinite wisdom and mercy to us to ordain them as *federal rites* wherein the new covenant is ratified to us, and to make them the *instruments* of our incorporation, union, life, and growth in the Body of Christ, and because He has constituted them the proper and efficacious means for the conveyance of His grace, pardon, and goodness to us, and has made them also to be *memorials* of His *past*, *pledges* of His *present*, and *earnests* of His *future love* to all who receive them worthily. and because He has appointed them to be *symbols* and tokens by which the members of Christ are distinguished from all who do not adore Him as their Lord."—*Bp. Christ. Wordsworth.*

"Mine is the sin, but Thine the righteousness,
Mine is the guilt, but Thine the cleansing blood.
Here is my robe, my refuge, and my peace,
Thy blood, Thy righteousness, O Lord, my God.

"Feast after feast thus comes and passes by;
Yet passing points to the glad feast above,
Giving sweet foretastes of the festal joy,
The Lamb's great bridal feast of peace and love."

The Sacrament of Baptism.

"Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

HOLY Baptism is a symbolical act, the authoritative Sacrament of initiation or reception into the visible Church of Christ, an emblem of the "washing of regeneration," a "*sign* of regeneration."

Baptism, like Circumcision, is a Divinely ordained ordinance, and just as the latter was obligatory upon the Jews, so is the former upon all who profess and call themselves Christians. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark xvi. 16).

When appointed by Christ, Baptism was not altogether a new symbol. Washings and purifications were common under the Old Testament dispensation, proselytes being admitted into the privileges of Judaism by Baptism. John the Baptist used water baptism as a sign of repentance. Christ himself was baptized. As the Head of His body, the Church, He thereby fulfilled the law, consecrated Himself to His great work, and at the same time sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin. Before His ascension He commanded His disciples, saying, "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 5).

To be baptized *into* a name (compare 1 Corinthians i. 13 and x. 2) is to be made believing disciples of the one who

bears that name, and participators in the blessings which he has to bestow. It was in accordance with our Lord's command that on the day of Pentecost they who had received the Word were baptized. (Acts ii. 41.) The Ethiopian eunuch, Cornelius and his friends, the Philippian jailer and his household, on confessing Christ were all baptized. And so up to the present time Baptism has been the initiatory act of grafting into the Christian Church, a mark of separation from the world, the badge of the soldier of the Cross.

Little need be said as to the mode of administration. The New Testament directions are very simple—water and the baptizing into the name of the Blessed Trinity are essential. Ministers are the proper persons to administer the rite. Complete immersion was doubtless the common practice in early times, but this is not always convenient. Happily, the efficacy of baptism does not depend upon the quantity of water used.

The proper subjects of Baptism are those who make a true confession of faith in Christ, and the children of one or both believing parents. The blessing of the old covenant was to the seed as well as to the parents, and the blessing of the new covenant cannot be less comprehensive (1 Cor. vii. 14).

The teaching of the Church of England with regard to Baptism is contained in Article XXVII., the Catechism, and the Baptismal Services. It is important to note that the Prayer Book assumes that those who use it are Christians not in name only, but in truth. The Article says :—

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

The Catechism sets forth the subject thus :—

"*Question.*—What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism ?

"*Answer.*—Water ; wherein the person is baptized *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

"*Question.*—What is the inward and spiritual grace ?

"*Answer.*—A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness : for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.

"*Question.*—What is required of persons to be baptized ?

"*Answer.*—Repentance, whereby they forsake sin ; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament.

"*Question.*—Why then are Infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them ?

"*Answer.*—Because they promise them both by their Sureties ; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform."

In the earlier portion of the Catechism the catechumen declares that "in his baptism he was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

In the Baptismal Services prayers are offered for the child to be baptized, after which the minister proceeds as follows :—"N. I baptize thee In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"We receive this Child into the congregation of Christ's flock, and do sign him with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter *he* shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil ; and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end. Amen.

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this child* is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits ; and with one accord make our prayers unto Him, that *this Child* may lead the rest of *his* life according to this beginning."

The child is dedicated to God—pronounced regenerate, not in the language of dogmatic theology, but of humble devotion. The saving benefit is ascribed to faith and prayer.

It would be presumption to assert that every baptized person is spiritually regenerate. The words must be taken as hypothetical or conditional.*

It would not be profitable to enter into the many controversies which have unhappily arisen relative to the nature, the subjects, and the effects of baptism.

In our own Church there have been many discussions as to the meaning of the word "regeneration." Some have taken it in a limited ecclesiastical sense, others in a spiritual. It has been held that in infant Baptism all original sin is washed away. Long treatises have been written as to the difference between "renovation," "regeneration," and "conversion," and the main truth has too often been obscured in a cloud of words.

Many have held the doctrine known as "Baptismal Regeneration," which declares that by the act of baptism the inward grace of a new nature is invariably imparted, though subsequently it may be lost.

An example of such teaching is found in Dr. Jelf's Bampton Lectures on the "Means of Grace" (1844), wherein he says, "The primary grace of Holy Baptism is a new birth, the putting off the old man, and putting on the new. There is, therefore, an immediate change of relation in the baptized person, even if he could be individually considered. What if there could be no interval between the font and the grave? What if the convert in full faith and repentance, or the unconscious infant should die immediately after his entrance into the baptismal covenant? Yet how differently he is circumstanced from what he was before the waters of Baptism passed over his soul! He was born and was living in a state of condemnation, he dies in a state of grace, and he is numbered at once without further struggle amongst 'the spirits of just men made perfect.'"

What a mixture here of truth with error! Such

---

* Dr. G. S. Faber, speaking of the *general* principles upon which the services of the Church were framed, says:—"As it were both dangerous and endless to subject the baptismal offices to be perpetually altered at the discretion of the priest, so as literally to suit this or that particular case, the Church, in *the judgment and hope of charity, speaks generally of all the baptized as having been likewise regenerated.*"—Sermons, vol. i., p. 227.

teaching cannot be proved by God's Word, and consequently it is not required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith. (Article VI.)

Still this theory of Baptismal regeneration is taught by many. These hold with the Rev. M. F. Sadler, that "any Church which professes to be guided by Scripture must connect Regeneration with the Baptism of infants, and must pronounce infants there and then grafted into Christ."—*Church Doctrine*, p. 104.

Teaching of this kind is but a modified form of that of the Church of Rome, as laid down by the Council of Trent, which declared:—"By Baptism, putting on Christ, we are made a new creature in Him, obtaining plenary and entire remission of sins. If any one shall say that by the Sacraments of the new covenant themselves grace is not conferred by the efficacy of the rite (*ex opere operato*), but that faith in the divine promise alone is sufficient for obtaining grace, let him be accursed."—*Sess.* vii., *Can.* 8.

Language such as this, applied to Baptism, clearly asserts that grace is contained in the Sacrament, and all sin taken away from the baptized.

But, to adopt the words of Dean Perowne, this "is materialism of the grossest kind. Grace is made a substance which can reside in matter. It is held in the water, and the water conveys it to the soul. The soul's own action has no part in the matter so long as it puts no bar, and in the case of baptized infants it is assumed they can put no bar, no sooner is the body brought into contact with the water than the grace of the water passes into the soul. There it resides, and dwells a potent germ and seed of life, hereafter to be developed and cherished till it attain to perfection, and then follows the possible conclusion that infants dying unbaptized, even though it be through no fault of their parents, as certainly it is through no fault of their own, cannot enter heaven."—*Sermon on Baptism*, 1883.

Dr. G. S. Faber, in reply to the question as to whether infants in Baptism are or are not invariably regenerated, gives this weighty answer: "In the unanimous judgment of the primitive Church, circumcision under the Law was a Sacrament of the very same moral intention as Baptism

under the Gospel. Whence, with great reason, the circumcision of infants has always been argumentatively employed to demonstrate the analogical propriety of the Baptism of infants. Now infants, as Scripture distinctly attests, might be outwardly circumcised in the flesh, without being inwardly circumcised in the heart. Therefore, under the premises of the case, it seems undeniably to follow that infants may be outwardly baptized in water without being inwardly regenerated by the Spirit."—*Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*, p. 277.

This view that Spiritual regeneration does *not* invariably accompany Baptism has been held by a large number of great divines in the Church of England, and has been fully vindicated by the late Dean Goode in his work entitled, "*The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants.*"

Here may fitly follow an extract from the important Judgment of the Privy Council given in the famous Gorham case. The then Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts) had refused to institute Mr. Gorham to the vicarage of Bramford-Speke on the ground that he denied spiritual regeneration to be conferred by the Sacrament of Baptism. The Privy Council, reversing the decision of the Court of Arches, decided in favour of Mr. Gorham, and in its judgment said: "The doctrine held by Mr. Gorham appears to us to be this—that Baptism is a Sacrament generally necessary to salvation, but that the grace of regeneration does not so necessarily accompany the act of Baptism that regeneration invariably takes place in Baptism; that the grace may be granted before, in, or after Baptism; that Baptism is an effectual sign of grace, by which God works invisibly in us, but only in such as worthily receive it—in them alone it has a wholesome effect; and that without reference to the qualification of the recipient it is not in itself an effectual sign of grace. That infants baptized, and dying before actual sin, are certainly saved; but that in no case is regeneration in Baptism unconditional. . . . It must be carefully borne in mind that the question, and the only question for us to decide, is whether Mr. Gorham's doctrine is contrary or repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England as by law established. . . . His Honour, Vice-Chancellor

Knight Bruce, dissents from the opinion we have formed; but all the other members of the Judicial Committee who were present are unanimously agreed in opinion that the doctrine held by Mr. Gorham is not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England as by law established."

It is because there are those in the Church of England who zealously teach the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration, as well on account of the dangerous tendencies of such teaching, that we have ventured to draw special attention to it. Strong as are some passages of the Catechism and Baptismal Services, they do not warrant the assertion that there is necessarily an infusion of grace, or the implanting of a germ of spiritual life in Baptism.

For a full view of truth one passage of the Prayer Book must be compared with another, nor must we fail to remember that our Articles again and again declare the Scriptures to be the great and only rule of faith. The Scriptures tell us that a person is united to Christ so soon as he believes with the heart the Word of Life. Baptism follows as a symbol of profession, a sign of regeneration, and a seal of adoption into the family of God. Let us ever be watchful against what has been called a sacramental Christianity, which speaks much of union begun only by Baptism, and kept up only by the Lord's Supper. Such outward unity—if there be no new birth and no heart service—will only add to our condemnation. We believe Holy Baptism to be binding on all Christians where it can be had. Nevertheless the penitent thief entered heaven without receiving it, whilst the case of Simon Magus clearly proves that all persons do not receive spiritual regeneration in Baptism. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Romans xiv. 17). "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans ii. 28, 29).

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be instructive to ask what is meant by "*Regeneration*." The word is found only in two places of the New Testament, in each of

which the application is different (Matthew xix. 28; Titus iii. 5). It is a metaphor expressing a change so great as to be compared to the birth of a child, "Ye must be born again." Spiritually used it signifies a change of heart, a quickening of the soul dead in sin, a change from darkness to light, a passing from death unto life, or, in the expressive language of our Church, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness."

On this deep subject, the words of Dr. Philip Schaff on the difference between Regeneration and Conversion are so clear and concise that we give them:—"*Regeneration* is a creative act of God the Holy Spirit, whereby a new spiritual life from above is implanted in man, through the means of grace, especially the preaching of the Gospel; like the natural birth it can occur but once. *Conversion* (which must not be confounded with Regeneration) is the corresponding subjective change of heart whereby man, under the influence of the Spirit, turns from the service of sin to the service of God. This may be repeated after a relapse."—*Lange, Com. on St. John*, p. 123.

What said Christ to Nicodemus? "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." This birth is from above. The power to regenerate is not conferred upon men, nor is the change effected by Sacraments. On this point God's Word is conclusive, "But as many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 12, 13).

St. Peter takes up the same thought, and gives in clear language the proof and medium of regeneration. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently. Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Peter i. 22, 23).

Of this new birth or Regeneration, Baptism is (as Article XXVII. declares) a visible sign and seal. "It does not *create* a person a child of God, but authoritatively declares him so." Hence our Lord's words to Nicodemus, "Except a

man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (John iii. 5).

On this verse Professor Westcott says :—"The words taken in their immediate meaning, as intelligible to Nicodemus, set forth as required before entrance into the kingdom of God, the acceptance of the preliminary rite divinely sanctioned, which was the seal of repentance, and so of forgiveness, and following on this the communication of a new life, resulting from the direct action of the Holy Spirit through Christ."—*Speaker's Commentary*.

To this we would add the eloquent words of Professor Watkins, which must commend themselves to all who ponder the mysterious subject of the new birth. Commenting on John iii. 8—"The wind bloweth where it listeth," etc., he says—"The new spiritual birth, like the physical, cannot be explained. We can observe the phenomena, we cannot trace the principle of life. There is the evidence of the new birth in the new life. We know not whence He comes, or whither He goes. We cannot fix the day or hour of the new birth with certainty . . . Individual spiritual life depends upon individual spiritual birth. The Baptism of the Spirit is needed for all. Now, indeed, coming as a fire burning in men's hearts, consuming the chaff of sin, while He purifies and stores up all that is true and good; now coming as in a moment, and arresting a man in a course of evil, revealing the iniquity of sin, and giving the power to reform; now coming as the gradual dawning of day upon the youthful soul who has never been wholly without it; here in a sermon or a prayer, there in the lessons of childhood; now by the example of a noble life, or the lessons of history; again in the study of scripture, or the truths written on the page of nature—the Spirit breatheth where He willeth."—*Bishop Ellicott's New Testament Commentary*, pp. 399, 400.

There is another important text on the subject of Baptism, which must not be passed over, Titus iii. 5 (with which may be read, Acts xxii. 16)—"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

The best authorities agree that the word translated

"washing" should be rendered by the term *laver* or *bath*, and refer the passage to the Ordinance of Baptism. The outward or visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace are both distinctly indicated.

Calvin's note on this passage so well expresses what we believe to be the teaching of our Church, that we give it:—"I have no doubt that he (St. Paul) alludes, at least, to Baptism, and even I will not object to have these passages expounded as relating to Baptism, not that salvation is declared in the outward symbol of water, but because Baptism seals to us the salvation obtained by Christ. Baptism—being the entrance into the Church, and the symbol of our ingrafting into Christ—is here appropriately introduced by Paul, where he intends to show in what manner the grace of God appeared unto us, so that the strain of the passage runs thus:—'God hath saved us by His mercy, the symbol and pledge of which He gave in Baptism, by admitting us into His Church, and ingrafting us into the body of His Son.' Now the apostles are wont to draw an argument from the Sacraments, to prove that which is here exhibited under a figure, because it ought to be held by believers that God does not sport with us by unmeaning figures, but inwardly accomplishes by His power what He exhibits by the outward sign; and, therefore, baptism is fitly and truly said to be 'the washing of regeneration.' The efficacy and use of the Sacraments will be properly understood by him who shall connect the sign and the thing signified, in such a manner as not to make the thing unmeaning and inefficacious, and who, nevertheless shall not, for the sake of adoring the sign, take away from the Holy Spirit what belongs to Him. Although, by Baptism, wicked men are neither washed nor renewed, yet it retains that power, so far as relates to God, because, although they reject the grace of God, still it is offered to them. But here Paul addresses believers, in whom Baptism is always efficacious, and in whom, therefore, it is properly connected with its truth and efficacy. It is the Spirit of God who regenerates us, and makes us new creatures; but because His grace is invisible and hidden, a visible symbol of it is beheld in Baptism."

Dean Alford, writing on the same passage in his Greek Testament, says:—"Let us take care that we know and

bear in mind what *Baptism* means: not the mere ecclesiastical act, not the mere fact of reception by that act among God's professing people, but that, completed by the Divine act, manifested by the operation of the Holy Ghost in the heart and through the life."

Let us, then, be on our guard against erroneous teaching on the subject of Baptism. It is a matter of painful experience that vast numbers have been baptized with water in infancy, whose spirit, conduct, and language in after-life have shown that they had never experienced any inward change, any heart renewal—"By their fruits ye shall know them." St. John, in his first Epistle, gives several certain tests whereby it may be seen whether a person is, or is not, really regenerated. "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not," *i.e.*, he does not wilfully sin, or knowingly live in sin. A morally regenerated person may be recognised as such—by "doing righteousness," by "purifying himself," by "loving the brethren," by a living faith that "Jesus is the Christ," by a "diligent keeping of himself so that the wicked one toucheth him not," and by a "victory over the world." If an individual cannot endure this testing by the Divine standard, he is as yet unregenerate.

St. Augustine, in his *Treatise on Baptism*, written 1,500 years ago, says:—"Outward Baptism may be administered where inward conversion of the heart is wanting: and on the other hand, inward conversion of the heart may exist where outward Baptism has never been received."

Archbishop Usher (1624) said, "Some have the outward sign, and not the inward grace. Some have the inward grace, and not the outward sign. We must not commit idolatry by deifying the outward element."

Such teaching we believe to be Catholic in the truest sense, and not only is it Catholic, but Apostolic also. St. Peter, after speaking of the salvation of Noah and his family in the Ark by water, says:—"The like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God" (1 Peter iii. 21).

The true idea of regeneration is happily set forth in the Collect for Christmas Day, thus:—"Grant that we being regenerate, and made Thy children by adoption and grace,

may daily be renewed by Thy Holy Spirit; through the same our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the same Spirit, ever one God, world without end." Amen.

In the Apostolic age adult Baptism was, by the very nature of things, the rule; infant Baptism the exception. But as Christianity spread, the Baptism of young children became common amongst believers. The words of our Church's Article on Baptism apply in the main, to those who have attained years of discretion. The closing sentence refers in cautious language to the Baptism of children :— "The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

The Church's great warrant for infant Baptism is seen in our Lord's words :—"Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xix. 14).

There are those who consider the practice of infant Baptism unscriptural on the ground that before Baptism there should be an intelligent confession of faith, and some evidence of a change of heart. It is admitted that Scripture does not furnish us with any direct instances of infant Baptism; yet the indirect evidence is very considerable. We read of the baptism of Lydia *and her household*; the Philippian jailer, *he and all his* (Acts xvi. 15, 33); and the *household of Stephanas* (1 Cor. i. 16). It is very probable that there were children in these families. The analogous rite of Circumcision under the old law goes to strengthen the argument in favour of infant Baptism. By Jehovah's express direction the child of eight days was admitted into the Church and commonwealth of Israel, and made a partaker of covenant blessings. Origen (Cent. iii.) bears testimony that in the Eastern Church, infant Baptism was of apostolic tradition, and history proves that it was general in the Western Church about the middle of the third century. St. Peter was commissioned to tend the *lambs* of the flock as well as the sheep. If little children are of the kingdom of heaven; if it is possible for them to be sharers in the covenant of grace, why forbid them the covenant sign, and seal?

It should be remembered that our Baptismal Services are framed upon the assumption that those who bring the child

to be baptized are themselves followers of Christ. Would that this great principle were more fully recognised; for as it has been well said, "Infant Baptism has no meaning without Christian family life and the guaranty of Christian education." In proof of this, see the closing Exhortation of the Service for the "Public Baptism of Infants."

A Sponsor is a promiser—a god-parent. The office of sponsorship is of great antiquity, dating from the age of Tertullian, who lived in the second century. Formerly, none were allowed to act as sponsors unless they were communicants. In the case of adults, sponsors testify to the character of the candidate for Baptism; in the case of infants their duty is to attend to the Christian education of the baptized. (See the Baptismal Services and the opening portion of the Church Catechism.)

"It is universally understood," says Canon Barry, "that the provision of sponsors is not so much a matter of necessity that Baptism is to be refused in default of it."—*Teacher's Prayer-Book.*

It is true that infants have not the power of knowing what takes place in Baptism, nor can they exercise faith—but children are from the Lord. He says to the parent, "Take this child and nurse it for Me." Can it be wrong to bring children to be admitted by Baptism into the visible Church of Christ, and so dedicated to Almighty God? Surely not!

"Christian parents—claim betimes for your children a place and a home in God's family, in Christ's Church below! Bring them early to the font of Holy Baptism: dedicate them there to your Saviour; ask His blessing; expect His grace for them, then take them back to your homes as Christ's little ones, as partakers of the covenant, as heirs of the kingdom. Teach them the laws of the kingdom; set before them its glories; foster in them its powers."—Dean Vaughan: *Liturgy and Worship of the Church of England*, p. 207.

As a supplement to Baptism, the Church of England has ordained the rite of *Confirmation*, or laying on of hands upon those that are baptized and come to years of discretion. Here the baptized person solemnly and publicly renews the Baptismal vow of Renunciation, Faith, and

Obedience. As a rule, the first reception of the Lord's Supper follows closely upon Confirmation, thereby admitting the person confirmed into the full privileges of the Christian Church. The word *Confirmation* means to *establish* or *strengthen*. Whatever grace and help are received are of God. "He which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God; who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts" (2 Cor. i. 21). The laying on of hands was often practised under both the Old Covenant and the New. It was generally an act of *blessing*, as in the cases of Jacob and the sons of Joseph (Gen. xlviii.), Moses and Joshua (Num. xxvii. 23), Christ and little children (Mark x. 16). So in the Confirmation Service the bishop prays:—"We make our humble supplication unto Thee for these Thy servants, upon whom (after the example of Thy holy Apostles), we have now laid our hands to certify them (by this sign) of Thy favour and gracious goodness towards them."

This ceremony of the laying of hands upon converts was practised in apostolic days, and has been observed from that time to the present. (See examples in Acts viii. 14—17; xix. 1—6). In the apostolic age special spiritual gifts followed; after a few years these extraordinary manifestations ceased, but the practice of laying on of hands continued. Says Hooker:—"The Fathers held Confirmation as an ordinance apostolic, always profitable in God's Church, although not always accompanied with equal largeness of those external effects which gave it countenance at the first." —*Eccl. Polity*, Book v., c. 66, s. 4.

Confirmation must not be looked upon as a mere form or necessity. "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." It is a solemn self-dedication to God. After it there must be a growth in grace, and in the knowledge of divine things. The warning given to the Hebrews must be heeded:—Leaving the principles—the foundations—as the doctrine of baptisms, and the laying on of hands, let us go on unto perfection (vi. 1, 2). There was a danger lest the Hebrew Christians should be recurring to, and resting upon, these first principles, and neglecting the higher teachings and duties of the Christian life. And this it must be

admitted is a present day danger. Well would it be if all confirmed persons realised more fully the depth of meaning contained in the words spoken over them at Confirmation :—

"Defend, O Lord, this Thy *servant*, with Thy heavenly grace, that *he* may continue Thine for ever; and daily increase in Thy holy Spirit more and more, until *he* come unto Thy everlasting kingdom. Amen."

We must now close this chapter. In preparing it we have constantly felt the difficulties which surround the question of Holy Baptism—difficulties which will not be fully cleared away until the perfect day dawn when the heirs of the kingdom shall see eye to eye. "Now we know in part." Let us be careful not to look upon the symbol as if it were the thing signified. "Ye must be born again." Nothing can possibly take the place of regeneration by the Spirit. If Baptism be a reality, it must, like circumcision, be "that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter" (Rom. ii. 29.) Apart from the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, Baptism cannot communicate any virtue.

Be it ever remembered that Baptism is a divinely appointed institution—"the token and seal of the Covenant." Let us honour it as such. Its importance is too often overlooked. The exhortation of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, was—"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). May it be ours to "remember always, that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession; which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him, that, as He died, and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness; continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."—*Baptismal Services.*

"Christian worshippers! sealed, all of you, in the days of unconscious infancy or later, with the mark and sign of regeneration, live your Baptism! It represents to us our profession; it assures us of our worship; it witnesses to us

of our glory. Buried with Him in Baptism, with Him may we rise, with Him live, with Him reign."—*Dean Vaughan.*

"Buried with their buried Saviour,
Raised with Him to life again;
Oh, that dead to sin, Thy children
May to Christ-like life attain.
Father, guide them by Thy Spirit,
Lead them on from strength to strength,
Till all toils and conflicts ended,
They are safe with Thee at length."

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"This do in Remembrance of Me."

THE nature and design of the Lord's Supper are clearly indicated in the four accounts given to us of its institution:—Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-26; Luke xxii. 14-20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-30. These passages should be carefully read. The key-note of the Lord's Supper and the secret of its deeper meaning are contained in our Lord's words, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

The Lord's Supper occupies a place in the Christian Church corresponding to that of the Passover Feast in the Jewish Church. Just as every Paschal Feast was a memorial of the first great Passover (Exodus xii. 14), so is the Lord's Supper a memorial, or "Remembrance," of the greater spiritual deliverance wrought by the death of Christ. "Even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness: but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor. v. 7, 8).

In the New Testament this Sacrament is designated "the Lord's Supper," "the Lord's Table," and the "Communion" (1 Cor. xi. 20; x. 16, 21). It was customary in the Paschal meal for the master in breaking the bread to *give thanks* (Luke xxii. 19). From this the Lord's Supper has been referred to as the *Eucharist*, a Greek work, meaning *Thanksgiving*. In the Church of Rome the Lord's

Supper is known as the Mass. At first the word Mass had no distinct theological meaning, and simply referred to the *dismissal* of a congregation. At length it came to be applied to the Communion Service, which, in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1549), is headed, "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." In the Prayer-Book of 1552 the word Mass was dropped, and has never since had any authoritative use in our Church.

The "Mass" as understood and celebrated in the Romish Church has the significance, not only of a Sacrament, but also of a Sacrifice, which the priest offers for the living and the dead, and in which the atoning sacrifice of Christ on Calvary is said to be continually repeated.

It is much to be regretted that there are those in the Church of England who are seeking to make the use of the word "Mass" familiar to their hearers.*

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has, unhappily, long been the battle-ground of contending parties in the Christian Church. A labyrinth of subtle speculations has gathered about it: storms of controversy have raged around it. The simple Sacrament ordained by Christ for the comfort and refreshment of His faithful people has not seldom been well-nigh obscured by the accretions and superstitions of weak and erring men.†

Before setting forth the views of the Church of England on this important subject, it may be well (having regard to present day controversies) to state the teaching of the

---

* Many proofs might be given; let one suffice—the advertisement of a work published since this chapter was written, entitled :—"Ceremonial Guide to Low Mass; or, Plain Directions for the Consecration and Administration of the Sacrament of the Holy Communion. Adapted to the use of the Church of England by Two Clergymen."

† "What would Saint Augustine have said, if he had seen the Ceremonies of late days used among us; whereunto the multitude used in his time was not to be compared? This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, than declare and set forth Christ's benefits unto us. And besides this, Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law, (as much of Moses' Law was,) but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit." —*Preface to the Book of Common Prayer.*

Church of Rome. This will be best done by quoting from the authorised documents of that Church. The following statements of doctrine are included in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, 1551 :—

"If any one denieth that in the Sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ, but saith that He is only therein symbolically, figuratively, or virtually, let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xiii., *Can.* 1.

"If any one saith, that in the sacred and holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species (accidents) of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xiii., *Can.* 2.

"If any one saith, that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the only begotten Son of God is not to be adored with the worship, even external called latria; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church; or is not to be exposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xiii., *Can.* 6.

"If any one saith that Christ given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xiii., *Can.* 8.

"If any one saith, that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not made to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xxii., *Can.* 1.

"If any one saith, that by those words, *Do this for the commemoration of Me* (Luke xxii. 19), Christ did not institute the apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His own body and blood; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xxii., *Can.* 2.

"If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a

sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits him only that receives, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and for the dead, for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema."—*Sess.* xxii., *Can.* 3.

These passages clearly prove that the Romish Church holds the Lord's Supper to be not merely a Sacrament, but also a propitiatory Sacrifice for sin, offered up to God by human priests, who are supposed, by virtue of the prayer of consecration, to change or transubstantiate the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. No wonder Bishop Jewel should exclaim—"These men have changed all things contrary to Christ's institution, and have made a private use of the Holy Communion, and so it cometh to pass that we give the Lord's Supper unto the people, and they give them a vain pageant to gaze upon."—*Apology for the Church of England*, part v.

Let us now turn to the authoritative teaching of the Church of England, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles, the Catechism, the Communion Service, and the Homilies.

The language of Articles XXVIII. and XXXI. is unmistakable, and is directly opposed to that of the Council of Trent.

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And

the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." —*Article* XXVIII.

"The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."—*Article* XXXI.

See next the Catechism, which sets forth the nature and benefits of the Lord's Supper, in words at once clear and Scriptural:—

"*Question.*—Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?

"*Answer.—For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.*

"*Question.*—What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?

"*Answer.*—Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

"*Question.*—What is the inward part, or thing signified?

"*Answer.*—The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

"*Question.*—What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?

"*Answer.*—The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.

"*Question.*—What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?

"*Answer.*—To examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life; have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death; and be in charity with all men."

The Communion Service throughout is in perfect harmony with the Articles and Catechism. The notice of Holy Communion begins thus :—

"Dearly beloved, on——day next I purpose, through God's assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; *to be by them received in remembrance of His meritorious Cross and Passion;* whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven."

The Exhortation at the time of Holy Communion gives prominence to the fact that the Lord's Supper is pre-eminently a Memorial Feast :—

"To the end that *we should alway remember the exceeding great love* of our Master, and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by His precious blood shedding He hath obtained to us; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a *continual remembrance of His death*, to our great and endless comfort."

The Prayer of Consecration declares its true nature :—

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, *a perpetual memory of that His precious death*, until His coming again," etc.

The words of administration are in conformity with the foregoing :—"The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and *feed on Him in thy heart by faith* with thanksgiving." "Drink this in *remembrance* that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful."

The fifth Rubric at the close of the service should also be noted :—

"And to take away all occasion of dissension, and superstition, which any person hath or might have concerning the Bread and Wine, *it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is*

usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten." This Rubric was substituted in 1552, for one which enjoined the use of wafer bread, "unleavened and round."

The declaration as to kneeling (commonly called the "Black Rubric") is also very important:—

"Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

This Rubric, which occupied a place in the Prayer-Book of 1552, was set aside in 1559, and restored in 1662, gives the reasons for kneeling, and distinctly declares that such attitude is not meant to imply adoration, either of the elements, or of any "Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," which are in heaven, at the right hand of God. This declaration is in perfect keeping with Article IV. of our Church.

We have seen that the Church of Rome declares the Lord's Supper to be, not only a Sacrament, but also a *propitiatory Sacrifice for sin*. This theory, which we hold to be contrary to Scripture, and opposed to the language of the Prayer Book, is, nevertheless, taught in a form more or less modified by many in the Church of England. "Christ commended to His Church a Sacrament of His

Body and Blood, they—the Romanists—have changed it into a Sacrifice for the quick and dead."—*Homily for Whitsunday.* Men are teaching the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence,* and claim to offer for their people on the altars of their churches, "the most holy Sacrifice which the Lord Jesus offered on the Cross."

The late *Dr. Pusey* wrote: "The Church of England taught, not an undefined, but a Real Objective Presence of Christ's Blessed Body and Blood. . . . We receive in the Eucharist not only the flesh and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself both God and man. . . . The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice depends upon the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. Where there is the apostolic succession, and a consecration in our Lord's words, there—it is held by Roman authorities too—is the Eucharistic Sacrifice."—*Eirenicon*, p. 23.

The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome, says:—"Is the Church of Rome the only Communion in which men may hold the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice? The real, actual, and visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches . . . Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore, the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them. The three great doctrines on which the Church has to take her stand are these:—(1) The *Real Objective Presence* of our blessed Lord in the Eucharist. (2) The *Sacrifice* offered by the priest. (3) The *Adoration* due to the presence of our blessed Lord therein."—*Plea for Toleration*, 1st edition.

The same clergyman, in his evidence before the Ritual Commission, stated that he considered himself to be a "sacrificing priest," authorised to offer a "propitiatory sacrifice."—*See ante*, p. 62.

The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie wrote:—"I believe that He sent His priests, as His Father had sent Him, to be priests on earth. I believe that by the power of this Consecration, and by the continual presence which He has promised with His priests, He does now, as in heaven and

* *Corporal*, having a body; not spiritual. *Objective*, real and natural; something outside, as opposed to—*Subjective*, which is inward consciousness; something distinct from external observation.

on earth (here as there, although under earthly veils, Himself both priest and victim) *offer in each Eucharist the same one all-sufficient sacrifice.*"—*Letter to the Congregation of St. Albans', Holborn*, 1867.

Utterances such as these by clergymen of the Church of England might, we regret to say, be greatly multiplied. Are they in accordance with God's Word? Unhesitatingly we answer, "They are not." Nor are they in harmony with the Book of Common Prayer, but the contrary.

Notwithstanding that those who hold and teach the doctrines just indicated, have solemnly and publicly declared their assent to the Book of Common Prayer, and have undertaken in public worship and the administration of the Sacraments to use no other, except as shall be lawfully authorised, the fact is that *unauthorised* Manuals and Prayer Books, containing Romish teaching in its most extreme form, are circulated and very largely used. As types of this class of Service Book we would name two, recently examined by us. The first is entitled, "*The Directorium Anglicanum, being a Manual of directions for the right celebration of the Holy Communion, etc.*" Second Edition. The large engraving prefixed to the work represents a priest, arrayed in costly sacrificial vestments and attended by acolytes, elevating a cup before a large crucifix erected over the "altar." The following extracts indicate the teaching with reference to the Lord's Supper:—"The Catholic priest who knows that this action is done in the person of Christ, who knows his office to be to perpetuate on the altars of the Church Militant on earth the same sacrifice which the great High Priest consummated once on the Cross and perpetuates, not repeats, before the mercy seat in Heaven, will reverently handle such tremendous mysteries, will be greatly careful that no dishonour be thoughtlessly done unto his Lord, who vouchsafes to be present on our altars."—(*Preface*, p. ix.) "As there is one altar, so can there be but one priest (acting in that capacity) whose place is to stand at first, *at, i.e.*, in front of the altar, on the North side, and after the Gospel *in medio altaris*, facing the East" (p. 2). "For this service there is required an ALTAR—raised as much as possible above the Nave. In all cases the slab or *mensa* of the altar should be of *one stone*" (pp. 3, 4). "After the Consecration

Prayer it is most desirable that no person passes before the Blessed Sacrament without genuflecting, bowing, or some token of reverence" (p. 61).

The second work we refer to is entitled—"*The Priest's Prayer Book.*" The copy examined bore the imprint, "Fifth edition, twelfth thousand." The preface states—"This volume is designed as an appendix to the Book of Common Prayer." On the Lord's Supper is an instruction containing the following passage—"The Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ under the forms of Bread and Wine (John vi. 51). Christ instituted it . . . . and empowered and bade His Apostles, and their successors the priests of His church, to '*Do* this,' *i.e.*, *offer this Sacrifice*, as He had done, to the end of time . . . . We cannot tell how the Bread and Wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, except it is by the power of the Holy Ghost, exerted in the act of consecration, *through the agency of the priests of the Church*, to whom Christ gave authority (1 Cor. xi. 24; Heb. v. 4). This is the doctrine of the Real Presence. The Consecrated Sacrament is the same Body which was crucified, only presented to our sight under another form."

Here, then, are the sources of the teaching of a considerable number of clergy of the Church of England concerning the Lord's Supper. We have given the authorised doctrine of our Church, and also that of the Church of Rome on this Sacrament, and find them to be directly opposed, the one to the other; and we have not the slightest hesitation in affirming that the Ritualistic teaching above indicated is essentially that of the Church of Rome, and not that of the Reformed Church of England.

We hold that in the Lord's Supper there is a sacrifice—*not* a propitiatory sacrifice for sin offered up by a priest, but a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, unitedly offered by people and ministers, as described in the Thanksgiving Prayer of the Communion Service, wherein we beseech God "Mercifully to accept this *our sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving." The Service throughout mentions no other sacrifice, save that of Christ, Who made on the Cross, "by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a *full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice*, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."—*Prayer of Consecration.*

Having regard to the language of the Prayer Book, we regret to find in the notes to that book, lately published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the following:—"We gather from Holy Scripture that this service was intended to have two aspects, a sacrificial aspect as the perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and a festal aspect as the banquet of Christ's Body and Blood, which are our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament." Where, we ask, is the Scriptural ground for the former portion of this sentence? We are directed to Malachi i. 11. "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering." We are aware that many Roman Catholic writers, ancient and modern, apply this verse to what they call the sacrifice of the Mass, but we hold that the passage has no reference whatever to the Lord's Supper. It finds its true application in the words of our Lord to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 21—24). The incense to be "offered in every place" is *prayer* (1 Tim. ii. 8). The "pure offering" is the "*body, a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom. xii. 1); *praise*, the fruit of the lips; and *doing good* (Heb. xiii. 15, 16). These, we repeat, are the *only* sacrifices of the Gospel. All Christians—ministers and people—can offer them. "Ye are an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5).

We conclude, then, that the sacrificial aspect of the Lord's Supper in a sacerdotal sense is opposed to the teaching both of the Bible and Prayer Book. Prebendary Sadler, himself a strong advocate of the sacrificial theory, candidly admits that "the Holy Eucharist has scarcely one feature in common with the things which in Scripture are called, and which English Christians commonly call, sacrifices."—*Church Doctrine*, p. 188.

The following facts are incontestable—(1) No sacrifice was offered by Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper. (2) There was no altar of sacrifice in the Upper Room. (3) The hour in which the Paschal Feast was eaten, was not the hour of sacrifice. (4) The recipients of the Lord's Supper reclined, this was not the position of sacrifice. (5)

Christ uttered no words of sacrifice; only words of thanksgiving. (6) The Epistle to the Hebrews (x. 12), declares that Christ, "after He had offered one sacrifice for ever (*i.e., to last for ever*), sat down on the right hand of God." If, then, the sacrifice of Christ cannot be repeated, the Lord's Supper cannot by any possibility be a repetition of it.

"Under the name of the Christian sacrifice (says Joseph Mede), the ancient Church understood not, as many suppose, the mere sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, but the whole sacred action or solemn service of the Church assembled." In the words of one of the Homilies, "We must take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest, of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts we have but one; lest, applying it to the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive."—*Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament.*

"The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou will not despise" (Ps. li. 17). "Let my prayer be set forth before Thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice" (Ps. cxli. 2).

Concerning the doctrine of the "Real Presence," as taught and understood by Roman Catholics and Ritualists, it is needful to add a few more words. The latter teach, to use their own expression, "the doctrine of a *Real Objective Presence*, that is to say, a presence in the Blessed Sacrament by virtue of the act of consecration, *and apart from the faith of the recipient*."—*Vide Church Times*, July 20th, 1883.

We believe that Christ is ever truly and spiritually present with His Church and people. We esteem the Lord's Supper as one of the highest acts of Divine worship. But in what way does the presence of our Blessed Lord in the Holy Communion differ from His presence at other times, when His faithful people meet for worship? In each and every case the presence is not corporal, but spiritual, and in accordance with the promise made by our Lord when on earth: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20).

> "Jesus, where'er Thy people meet,
> There they behold Thy mercy-seat;
> Where'er they seek Thee Thou art found,
> And every place is hallowed ground."

This we maintain to be the real presence—a spiritual, and not a bodily presence—in which the Church of England believes. The Bible and Prayer Book assert this doctrine of a spiritual presence only, declaring in distinct tones that Christ rose from the dead, "and took again His body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; Wherewith He ascended into heaven, and *there sitteth* until He return to judge all men at the last day."—Article IV. This exactly accords with the words of St. Augustine: "When the flesh of our Lord was on earth, certainly it was not in heaven; and now that it is in heaven, it is not on earth."

Let the following testimonies be added to those already given in further proof that there is a sad departure by some in our midst from the faith of our fathers:—

"*The English Catholic's Vade Mecum*" (Ritualistic)] gives the following as an "act of faith":—"I most firmly believe that in this Holy Sacrament Thou art present verily and indeed; that here are Thy Body and Blood, Thy Soul and Thy Godhead" (p. 39).

On page 46 of the same work is this verse:—

> "Oh, see! within a creature's hand
> The vast Creator deigns to be,
> Reposing infant-like, as though
> On Joseph's arm or Mary's knee.
> Sweet Sacrament, we thee adore,
> Oh make us love thee more and more."

In the "*Little Prayer Book*" (Ritualistic) is this direction:—"At the words, This is My Body, this is My Blood, you must believe that the bread and wine become the Real Body and Blood, with the soul and Godhead of Jesus Christ; bow down your head and body in deepest adoration when the priest says these awful words, and worship your Saviour then verily and indeed present on His altar" (p. 18).

In the year 1873, a petition to the bishops, signed by 480 clergy of the Church of England, asked for alterations in the Prayer Book which would "tend to the more distinct enunciation" of the doctrines of—(1) "The Real Presence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the Holy

Communion, 'under the form of bread and wine.' (2) The adoration due to Him there present. (3) The Sacrifice which He there offers by the hands of His priest to the Divine Majesty."

The Rev. Dr. Littledale writes :—"In the Holy Communion, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are that same body and blood which were conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and ascended into heaven."—*On the Real Presence.*

The Rev. G. C. Ommanney, in *Notes on the Real Presence* (1890), says :—"When a priest, rightly ordained, consecrates bread and wine in the proper form—*i.e.*, that appointed by our Lord, the bread really becomes the Body of Christ, the wine really becomes His precious Blood by the power of the Holy Spirit. *The same Body*—born of Mary, crucified, buried; that rose, ascended, and sits on high at the right hand of God; the same precious Blood, shed on Calvary as the price of our redemption, are present as really, though not in the same way, as when Christ was on earth. The Body and Blood of Christ being present, He is there in His fulness; His body, soul, human and divine natures, are present. This presence is real—as real as the presence of God in heaven; *objective*—independent of our faith, feelings, adoration, or neglect; *spiritual* and *supernatural*—therefore not recognised by our senses."

Whence do such teachers derive their theories? Most assuredly not from the Bible or Prayer Book: nor yet, as Hooker clearly shows, from the writings of such fathers as St. Augustine: but from Mediæval authors.*

We have endeavoured to trace the source of such materialising teaching, and find that its leading exponent was Paschasius Radbert, Abbot of Corbie. How strange that present-day teachers should be so ready to go to the dark

* Archdeacon Hare, in his preface to the "*Mission of the Comforter*," writes :—"They who swallow the theology, either of the Fathers or of the Middle Ages, in the gross, find themselves out of place in a Protestant Church; and while they wish to revive the Church of the Middle Ages, and confound faith with credulity, they are just fitted for the surrender of their reason and conscience to the arbitrary mandates of the Papacy."

ages for light! Paschasius, in the year 831, drew up a treatise on the Eucharist for the use of the younger monks. Concerning this, Canon Robertson says:—"In this treatise, '*De Corp. et Sanguine Domini*,' the rhetoric of early writers is turned into unequivocally material definitions. Paschasius lays it down that, although after the consecration, the appearance of bread and wine remain, yet we must not believe anything else to be really present than the body and blood of the Saviour—the same flesh which was born of the Blessed Virgin—the same in which He suffered on the Cross, and rose from the grave."—*History of the Christian Church*, Third ed., p. 316.

It is very interesting to compare this mediæval teaching with that which we have just quoted. We unhesitatingly assert that it is altogether opposed to that of the Church of England. The wonder is that any ordained minister of our Church can promulgate such opinions in the face of the clear utterances of the Prayer Book to which he has given his solemn assent. The language of the Church is:—"The sacramental bread and wine are still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; *and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.*"—*Rubric, Communion Service.*

But, say the advocates of the real bodily presence, we teach what Scripture teaches. Christ said:—"Take eat, *this is My body*. Drink ye all of it, for *this is My blood*" (Matt. xxvi. 26—28), and "Except ye *eat the flesh* of the Son of Man, and *drink* His blood, ye have no life in you" (John vi. 53).

As to the first of these passages, what did our Lord mean? To interpret the words in their purely literal sense is simply impossible, for when our Lord uttered them His body and blood were actually present before the disciples in His own person, and therefore could not possibly be at the same time in His hand or on the table. Scholars tell us that in the Hebrew and Chaldee languages there is no term to represent the word "signify." Hence in Ex. xii. 11, the words "it *is* the Lord's Passover," mean, it *represents* the Lord's

Passover. So in the Parable of the tares (Matt. xiii.), "the field *is* the world, the good seed *are* the children," etc., the verb *to be* is used throughout, for the verb "*to represent*." Other examples are found in John x. 7, "I *am* the door;" also in Gal. iv. 25, "This Agar *is* Mount Sinai," meaning, of course, "This Agar *represents* Mount Sinai." In the sentence, "This cup *is* the New Testament in My blood" (Luke xxii. 20), no one would take the cup to mean literally the New Testament, or New Covenant, but would look upon the expression as a figure of speech. On the same principle our Lord's words can have no other meaning than :—"This bread *represents* My body. This wine *represents* My blood; My body broken, and My blood shed in all their saving efficacy and spiritual power. Do this in remembrance of Me." The Lord's Supper *commemorates* a sacrifice. *Christ* offered the sacrifice, *we* keep the feast.

The second passage brought forward is :—"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." This, and similar expressions, in John vi., are quoted by Roman Catholics and others, in proof of their teaching on the Real Presence. It would be easy to multiply quotations from leading scholars of the Church of England to show that such an application is altogether untenable, but one shall suffice, that of Professor Westcott, in his well-known and learned Commentary on St. John's Gospel :—"It follows that what is spoken of 'eating of the bread which cometh down from heaven' (ver. 51); 'eating the flesh of the Son of Man' (ver. 53); 'eating His flesh and drinking His blood' (ver. 54-56); 'eating Him' (ver. 57); 'eating the bread which came down from heaven' (ver. 58)—the succession of phrases is most remarkable—cannot refer primarily to the Holy Communion; nor again can it be simply prophetic of that Sacrament. The teaching has a full and consistent meaning in connection with the actual circumstances, and it treats essentially of spiritual realities, with which no external act, as such, can be coextensive. The well-known words of Augustine, *Crede et manducasti:* "Believe, and thou *hast* eaten," give the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence."—*Speaker's Commentary, New Testament*, vol. ii., p. 113.

Hear what four most eminent divines of our Church say

on the presence of Christ in the Sacraments! Richard Hooker writes—"The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament, and with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth, first 'take and eat,' then 'this is My Body which is broken for you;' first 'drink ye all of this;' then followeth, 'this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the Bread is His Body, or the Cup His Blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them . . . It appeareth not that of all the ancient fathers of the Church, anyone did ever conceive or imagine other than only a mystical participation of Christ's both Body and Blood in the Sacrament, neither are their speeches concerning the change of the elements themselves into the Body and Blood of Christ, such that a man can thereby in conscience assure himself it was their meaning to persuade the world either of a corporal consubstantiation of Christ with those sanctified and blessed elements before we receive them, or of the like transubstantiation of them into the Body and Blood of Christ."—*Ecclesiastical Polity*—Book v., clxvii., ss. 6, 11.

These words of Hooker may be fitly supplemented by those of St. Augustine, who says—"This is to eat that meat and drink that drink; even for a man to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him; and, therefore, whoso dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt, doth neither eat His flesh, nor drink His blood."—*In Johan. Tract:* (Oxford); xxvi., s. 18, p. 412.

Bishop Beveridge, on Article XXVIII., says—"Scripture and fathers holding forth so clearly that whosoever worthily receives the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, doth certainly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, the devil thence took occasion to draw men into an opinion that the Bread which is used in that Sacrament is the very body that was crucified upon the cross, and the wine, after consecration, the very blood which gushed out of His pierced side. The time when this opinion was first broached, was in the days of Gregory III., Pope of Rome."—[A.D. 731.]

Dr. Waterland, in his well-known work on the doctrine

of the Eucharist (1737), writes :—"The words, *verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful*, are rightly interpreted of a real participation of the benefits purchased by Christ's death. The body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful, not corporally, not internally, but verily and indeed, that is, *effectually*. The sacred symbols are no bare signs, no untrue figures of a thing absent; but the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefits of Christ's body broken, and blood shed, that is of His passion, are really and effectually present with all them that receive worthily. This is *all the real presence* that our Church teaches."

Archbishop Longley in his last Charge, published in 1868, said :—"The doctrine of the real presence, is in one sense, the doctrine of the Church of England. She asserts that the body and blood of Christ are 'verily and indeed received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.' And she asserts equally, that such presence is not material or corporal, but that Christ's body is 'given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.'"—Article XXVIII.

It will be seen that these opinions (like a great number of others which might be given) are all directly opposed to the teachings of Ritualism, and are in exact accord with the authoritative language of the Church of England.

Another important text often quoted by upholders of the sacerdotal theory, is Heb. xiii. 10 :—"We have an altar." This passage is applied to the Lord's table on which the priest is said to offer a propitiatory sacrifice. We venture to think that the verse has no reference whatever to the Lord's table, and in support might quote a great number of learned Commentators. Let the following suffice :—

Dean Alford, in his Greek Testament, says :—"The Lord's table may be said to represent to us the Cross whereon the sacrifice was offered, but it is not the altar in any propriety of language." *Dr. Lange*, in his great Commentary, says :—"The altar is not the table of the Lord's Supper." *Professor A. B. Davidson*, in his Commentary on Hebrews, says :—"There seems no allusion in the expression, 'We have an altar,' to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." *Bishop Wordsworth*, in the notes on

Hebrews, in his Greek Testament (after quoting 1 Peter ii. 5), says :—" If the apostle had supposed that Christ's body and blood is offered as a sacrifice on the Christian altar on earth, he would not surely have omitted to say so in describing the Christian altar and the Christian sacrifice." *Dr. Kay*, in the Speaker's Commentary, says :—" The cross was as little an altar as the Roman soldiers were priests. Nor yet can it be understood of the Lord's table. . . . It is Christ's own Divine-human personality." *Canon Farrar*, in the Cambridge Bible for Colleges, says :—" There is no reference to the material 'table of the Lord,' and only a very indirect reference (if any) to the Lord's Supper. Nothing can prove more strikingly and conclusively the writer's total freedom from any conceptions resembling those of the 'sacrifice of the mass,' than the fact that he here speaks of *our* sacrifices as being the 'bullocks of our lips.' The Christian priest is only a presbyter, not a sacrificing priest."

The following is from the important Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the well-known Bennett case, delivered June 8th, 1872. In this the teaching of the Church of England on the Lord's Supper, is clearly, accurately, and authoritatively set forth, thus—" *Presence of Christ in the Sacrament.* The Church of England holds and teaches affirmatively, that in the Lord's Supper, the Body and Blood of Christ are given to, taken, and received by the faithful communicant. She implies, therefore, to that extent, a presence of Christ in the ordinance, to the soul of the worthy recipient. As to the mode of this presence, she affirms nothing, except that the Body of Christ 'is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,' and that 'the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.' Any other presence than this—any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver—the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies affirm, or require her ministers to accept. This cannot be stated too plainly. *As to Sacrifice.* The next charge against the respondent is, that he has maintained that the Communion Table is an Altar of Sacrifice, at which the priest appears in a sacerdotal position at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and

that at such celebration there is a great sacrifice or offering of our Lord by the ministering priests, in which the mediation of our Lord ascends from the altar to plead for the sins of men. The Church of England does not, by her Articles or Formularies, teach or affirm the doctrine maintained by the respondent. That she has deliberately ceased to do so would clearly appear from a comparison of the present Communion Office with that in King Edward VI's. first book, and of this again with the Canon of the Mass in the Sarum Missal. This subject was fully discussed before their lordships, in Westerton v. Liddell, when it was decided that the change in the view taken of the Sacrament naturally called for a corresponding change in the altar. It was no longer to be an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper. *As to Adoration.* The Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements."

Such was the deliberate opinion of the highest court in England—composed of Bishops and Judges—with regard to this important matter.

Well would it be if the earnest and burning words of Dean Vaughan on this vital subject could be re-echoed throughout our land, and pondered by all who attend our churches. He says—"That it should be given to man instrumentally, by hand and tongue, to create God; to turn common bread and common wine, by a few movements of the hand, and a few utterances of the lips, into the very body and blood of Him who made the worlds; this was the keystone of that arch of priestly domination which once bestrode the world: it was this which made possible the public sale of indulgences, and the domestic tyranny of the Confessional: it was this which drew the life-blood of our English martyrs, who felt that its overthrow was worth the dying for: it is this which English innovators, calling themselves restorers, would now bring back upon us—from whose errors, or follies, or impostures, call them what you will, may God preserve evermore His true, His faithful, His Apostolical Church of England!"—*Liturgy and Worship of the Church of England*; 2nd edition, p. 224.

We have given the authoritative teaching of the Church of

England on the Lord's Supper; also that of the Church of Rome; and have indicated doctrine which we believe to be erroneous and dangerous.

We believe that Christ is really, and effectually, and continually present with His Church on earth in accordance with His promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20). We believe also that there is a real presence of Christ in the heart of every true believer in agreement with St. Paul's prayer, "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith" (Eph. iii. 17). We believe too that Christ is spiritually present with His assembled people in fulfilment of His promise, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." Further, we believe that Christ is spiritually present in the Lord's Supper in order to vouchsafe a special blessing to all who with a true heart and lively faith assemble at His table. But the doctrine of any corporal, objective, or bodily presence, we reject and protest against as being opposed to common sense, repugnant to God's Word, and contrary to the teaching of the Prayer Book, which declares that the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not on earth. If Christ be present in any bodily sense, what meaning is there in the apostle's words, "Till He come?" (1 Cor. xi. 26).

To sum up, the Lord's Supper is a divinely appointed institution—a sacred feast—to which all God's faithful people are bidden. In one sense Christ is *absent* from it, inasmuch as, in His glorified humanity, He is at the right hand of the Father. But in His Omnipresent Deity He is *really present* to bless His servants. The Sacrament itself is a *Memorial* of the one perfect sacrifice offered on Calvary. It is an *Emblem* of the Saviour's love. It is a *Proclamation* of the benefits of Christ's death. It is a *Communion* which disciples have with their Lord, and with one another. It is an *Eucharist*, an offering of praise and thanksgiving to our God. It is a *Seal* of covenant blessings. It is a *Pledge* that Christ will come again. It is an *Evidence* of the truth of Christianity. It is a blessed *Means of Grace*—a hallowed *Feast*—in which the believer feeds on Christ in his heart by faith with thanksgiving. The participation of it is a *Token* of

Christian profession. It is a *Sacrament* obligatory on all believers—"Do this in remembrance of Me."

Let us study to have clear and Scriptural views concerning the Lord's Supper. May the Holy Spirit enable us to honour it. Let us be careful not to look upon it as a kind of passport to heaven. It is exclusively for God's children, and not for the unregenerate. "Regard the outward signs (the bread and wine) reverently, but not superstitiously; use them as means, not ends; symbols, not idols. Feed on *Him*, not on them, in thine *heart*, not with thy mouth; by *faith*, not by sight, with thanksgiving." "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life" (John vi. 63.)

"Bread of the world in mercy broken,
Wine of the soul in mercy shed,
By whom the words of life were spoken,
And in whose death our sins are dead.
Look on the heart by sorrow broken,
Look on the tears by sinners shed,
And be Thy feast to us the token,
That by Thy grace our souls are fed."

Confession and Absolution.

"Who can forgive sin but God only?"

THE practice of Auricular Confession, *i.e.*, secret confession of sin to a priest, is, unhappily, gaining ground in the Church of England. It is not uncommon to see in our Churches a notice stating the hours at which ministers attend to hear confessions. The practice of secretly confessing sin to a priest is sanctioned by some holding high positions in our Church. Its advantages and necessity are preached from the pulpit—enforced in the Confirmation Class, enjoined by certain devotional Manuals, and taught in the Sunday School. Indeed, the words once applied by the late Bishop S. Wilberforce, to the late Dr. Pusey, might, at the present time be justly applied to not a few of the clergy of our Church—"You seem to me to be habitually assuming the place and doing the work of a Roman confessor, and not that of an English clergyman."

We cannot admit that the practice of auricular confession, with the accompanying priestly absolution, has any Scriptural warrant whatever. We believe it to be opposed to the teaching of the Church of England, and contrary to the principles of the Gospel of Christ.

Secret confession of sin to a priest was unknown in the Christian Church during the Apostolic age, and for some

centuries afterwards. The practice doubtless had its origin in the monastery. It is clear from the published Sacramentaries and Liturgies of Gelasius, who was Pope of Rome A.D. 496, that the Roman priests had not at that time arrogated to themselves the power of granting absolution. Auricular confession was unknown in the early British Church, and was introduced into England by Archbishop Theodore, in the seventh century. (*See Soames' Anglo-Saxon Church*).

In the eighth century, the Church of Rome sought to make confession to a priest compulsory, but it was not imposed as an Article of the Romish Faith until the thirteenth century.

On this point, Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, in a recent address to his clergy, said:—"The Church of England, grounding her doctrine on Holy Scripture, teaches that it appertains to Almighty God, and to Him alone, to forgive sins (Commination Service). The Church of England teaches that it is repugnant to Holy Scripture, and to the doctrine and practice of the ancient Catholic Church, to affirm that it is necessary for men to confess their sins privately to a priest in order to obtain pardon . . . The divines of the Church of England have proved that the doctrine of the Church of Rome, that private or auricular confession to a priest is necessary, was not generally received in the twelfth century, and was first imposed as an Article of Faith in the year 1215, at the Fourth Council of Lateran."

The authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome on Confession as set forth in the decrees of the Councils of Lateran and Trent, is as follows:—

"Every believer of either sex, after coming to years of discretion, *shall faithfully confess all his sins alone, at least once a year, to his own priest*, and shall endeavour to the utmost of his power to fulfil the penance enjoined, receiving reverently, at least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, unless, perhaps, through the counsel of his own priest, for some reasonable cause, he should conclude to abstain at that time from its reception; *otherwise let him be prohibited from entering the Church while living, and dying be deprived of Christian burial.* Wherefore, let this salutary law be frequently published in the Churches, lest any one may

assume the veil of excuse from the blindness of ignorance." —*Council of Lateran*, Can. 21, A.D. 1215.

"If any shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted, and is necessary for salvation by Divine right, or shall say that the custom of confessing secretly to the priest alone, which the Catholic Church has always observed from the beginning, and continues to observe, is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, let him be accursed." —*Council of Trent*, Sess. xiv. Can 6, 7.

In vain shall we search God's Word for any one text in support of this teaching. If such doctrine be true, then the office of Christ has ceased, and He is no longer the *one* Mediator between God and man. But in no single text are persons enjoined to unlock the secrets of their hearts to earthly priests

With these historical facts before us, let us now consider auricular confession as advocated and practised by some within the Church of England. The leader in this matter was undoubtedly the late Dr. Pusey. By word and pen he most earnestly sought to introduce private and systematic confession into our Church.

To this end he edited a Roman Catholic manual on the subject, with the following title:—"*Advice to those who exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation through Confession and Absolution, being the Abbé Gaume's* MANUAL FOR CONFESSORS, *etc., adapted for the use of the English Church.*"

In this work, parents are urged to bring *children* to confession from the time they are seven years old: omitting to do so they are charged with great negligence (p. 159). Dr. Pusey defended his position by referring to the Ordination Service, thus:—"So long as these words of our Lord: '*Whose sins Thou dost forgive, they are forgiven,*' are repeated to us when we are ordained, so long will there be confession in the Church of England."—*Letter to Times, Nov. 29th*, 1866. On this passage we refer the readers to pages 66, 67, where this text is more fully noticed. Here we would only add that Dr. Pusey's application of the words to auricular confession is clearly opposed to the opinions of the leading theologians of our Church.

In order that the pronounced teaching of the Ritualistic party on the subject of Confession may be adequately

realised, we give the following extracts from three of their Manuals.*

"*The Priest's Prayer Book*," in "Notes on Confession," says:—"The confessional is the tribunal of mercy, not that of justice. The Church, or at least its vestry, is the proper place for hearing confessions. A quarter of an hour is usually a sufficient time for an ordinary confession. When a penitent is afraid to confess any particular sin, the priest may often encourage him by assuming that the sin is much graver than any he is likely to have committed. Penances must be adapted to age, sex, condition," etc.

"*The English Catholic's Vade Mecum*" prescribes the manner of confession to a priest, thus:—"I confess to Almighty God, to Blessed Mary, to all Saints, and to thee my ghostly father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, by my own fault (*Here strike your breast thrice*). Since the time of my last confession, when I received absolution, and which was...ago, I accuse myself. (*Here will follow the particulars of the Confession.*) For these and for all my other sins which I cannot now remember, I am heartily sorry; and most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance, counsel, and absolution, of thee my ghostly father. (*Here the Priest will give any needful instruction or direction, and will assign a penance. The Absolution and Benediction will follow*)," p. 35.

In the "*Treasury of Devotion*," edited by Canon Carter, formerly Rector of Clewer, appear—"Prayers before Confession," "Form for Sacramental Confession," and "Thanksgiving after Confession." With these are the following directions:—"When you desire to make a confession to a priest call to mind your sins in a certain order, such as may help you to remember them. Enumerate singly, distinctly, and fully, all the sins which weigh on your conscience, telling their number and their character . . . . If it be not your first confession, mention the time when you last confessed, and say whether you performed the penance that was given you" (p. 134.)

* "*The Priest in Absolution*"—published for the use of those clergy who advocate the Confessional—cannot, we are informed, be obtained from the publishers without a reference from some well-known member of the English Church Union.

In addition to recommending the use of Manuals of this class, the clergy who favour the Confessional, diligently circulate among the members of their guilds and fraternities, works and translations of Roman Catholic writers, containing Romish teaching of the most pronounced character. Here is an extract from one of Fenelon's works, belonging to the "Female Branch" of the guild attached to an important town church:—"The power which Jesus Christ gave to His ministers to bind and loose, to forgive and retain sins, is absolute and without restriction. But they cannot absolve secret sins which are not made known to them. Therefore, this ministry implies the avowal of sins, either public, or at least, private. This is confession. When it is only auricular, *i.e.*, made to the ear of one, it is the least that can be required. *As to the minister, he has unrestricted power to remit all sins.*"—*Spiritual Letters to Women (Rivingtons)*, p. 229.

Such are a few specimens of the disloyal, and we venture to add, most unscriptural teaching, put by some of the clergy into the hands of their people. Reading such passages as those indicated with our Bible and Prayer Book open before us, we are filled with pain and wonder. That such teaching is assuming large proportions in our Church is indicated by the fact that in the year 1873, no fewer than 480 "priests" petitioned the bishops to authorise (amongst other things), an Order of Licensed Confessors in the Church of England. The exact words of this petition are:—"That in view of the wide-spread and increasing use of Sacramental Confession, your venerable house may consider the advisability of providing for the education, selection, and licensing of duly qualified confessors, in accordance with the provisions of canon law."

But it may be asked, "What is the authoritative teaching of the Church of England as to confession and absolution?" We will endeavour to give a short answer to this important question. In the Book of Common Prayer are *three* forms of absolution, to be pronounced by the minister, viz.:

(I.) That in the Morning and Evening Services, whereby after a general confession of sin by the congregation, the minister declares that HE—God—pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His Holy

Gospel. Here is no claim on the part of the minister to remit sin, but a touching and beautiful declaration of the Gospel. See, then, in our Church's daily services her model of repentance, confession, and absolution.

(II.) The second form of absolution is that in the Communion Service. It follows a confession of sin, made, not to any earthly priest, but to our Father in Heaven. This absolution is not like that in the Daily Services, *declaratory*, but *precatory*, or INTERCESSORY—a beautiful and comprehensive prayer, full of comfort to the sincere penitent :—

"Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of His great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto Him ; Have mercy upon you ; pardon and deliver you from all your sins ; confirm and strengthen you in all goodness ; and bring you to everlasting life ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Here, then, is another of our Church's models for confession and absolution. But there is a passage in the Second Preface in the Communion Service, which is held by the advocates of auricular confession to sanction the practice. We give the passage as it now stands in our Prayer Book, and also as it appeared in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. :—

Prayer Book now in use.	*Prayer Book of* 1549.
"And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the holy Communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience ; therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief ; *that by the ministry*	"If there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned *priest*, taught in the law of God, and *confess and open his sin and grief secretly*, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and that *of us* (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may

of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

receive comfort and absolution to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness, *requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to a priest.*"

Let the reader compare the above, and carefully note the alterations and omissions. In our present Prayer Book the word "*minister*" is substituted for "*priest*:"—the words "*confess*," "*sin*," and "*secretly*," are omitted, and the penitent is invited only to "open" his grief." Instead of the words "that of *us*, etc.," he may receive absolution, we read "that *by the ministry of God's Holy Word* he may receive the benefit of absolution," whilst the closing paragraph of the Prayer Book of 1549 as to those who use "auricular and secret confession" is *altogether omitted* in our present Prayer Book. If these important alterations and omissions signify anything, we venture to say they indicate that the compilers refused any longer to offer any sanction to the continuance of secret confession. As to what the words were intended to provide for we give the words of Canon Barry:—"The third paragraph evidently provides for exceptional cases, in which a 'man cannot quiet his own conscience,' but requires 'further comfort' in assurance of God's forgiveness, and 'further counsel,' as to the right way of receiving it. In these cases, the man is invited to come to the priest himself, or to some other minister of God's Word to 'open his grief' (apparently the special thing that troubles his conscience), and to receive according to his need, first, the 'benefit of absolution,' and next the guidance of ghostly counsel and advice. It is to be observed that the initiative is left wholly to the man himself, and that confession is neither made obligatory, nor even recommended as the normal and regular practice of the devout Communicant."—*Note in the Teacher's Prayer Book.*

(III). The third form of absolution in our Church's

Services is that in the "Visitation of the Sick." Here are the words, with the Rubric which precedes :—

¶ *Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort.*

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

This form is prescribed for an exceptional case, and can only be used to a sick or dying man, "*if he humbly and heartily desire it.*" Canon Barry, writing on this, says :— (*a*) "The confession is to be made only if, after all instruction, and exhortation, and prayer, the sick man 'feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.' (*b*) By the 'special confession of his sins' is evidently intended, not an exhaustive confession of all sins, but a special confession of the particular matters which are on his conscience."

Here we would specially note three most important historical facts which bear on the subject of this chapter :— (1) The words in our Church's form of Ordering of Priests, "Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," cannot be found in any Ordinals of the Universal Church prior to the twelfth century, nor does the Greek Church now possess them. This fact is given on the authority of Morinus, a learned Roman Catholic writer on ancient ritual. (2) In the thirteenth century, the form of absolution used by the priest, "Dominus te absolvat, *May the Lord absolve thee*," was changed into "Ego te absolvo, *I absolve thee.*" (3) The alterations and omissions made by the compilers of our present Prayer Book in 1552, as indicated above.

Let us now hear the direct statements of the Church of England on this subject. By her Homilies she distinctly condemns the practice of auricular confession. Replying to those who used the passage, "Confess your faults one to another" in support of the confessional, her language is :—

"Whereas the adversaries go about to wrest this place, for to maintain their auricular confession withal, they are greatly deceived themselves and do shamefully deceive others, for if this text ought to be understood of auricular confession, then the priests are as much bound to confess themselves to the lay people as the lay people are bound to confess themselves to them; and if to pray is to absolve, then the laity by this place hath as great authority to absolve the priests as the priests have to absolve the laity. And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper to prove auricular confession to stand on God's Word: 'Go thy way, show thyself unto the priest' (Matt. viii. 4), do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy, before he was by Christ sent unto the priest, and by the same reason we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy —I mean our sins must be forgiven us before that we come to confession. What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, sith that they be already taken away. And, therefore, holy Ambrose, in his second sermon upon the 119th Psalm, doth say full well, 'Go show thyself unto the priest.' Who is the true priest but He who is the priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec? Whereby this holy father doth understand that, both the priesthood and the law being changed, we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ, who being our Sovereign Bishop, doth, with the sacrifice of His body and blood, offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him. Moreover, these are St. Augustine's words: 'What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confession, as though they were able to heal all my diseases? A curious sort of men to know another man's life, and slothful to correct or amend their own! Why do they seek to hear of me what I am, which will not hear of thee what they are? And how can they tell, when they hear by me of myself, whether I tell the truth or not; sith that no mortal man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man which is in him?' Augustine would not have written thus, if auricular confession had been used in his time. Being, therefore, not led with the conscience thereof.

let us with fear and trembling, and with a true contrite heart, use that kind of confession that God doth command in His Word; and then doubtless, as *He is faithful and righteous, He will forgive us our sins, and make us clean from all wickedness.* . . I do not say but that, if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and show the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them, that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's Word; *but it is against the true Christian liberty* that any man should be bound *to the numbering of his sins*, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of *blindness and ignorance.*"—*Homily on Repentance, Part* ii.

In the year 1873, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (Tait and Thomson), in a joint reply to an address presented to them on the subject of the Confessional said:—"We believe that through the system of the confessional great evil has been wrought in the Church of Rome, and that our reformers acted wisely in allowing it no place in our Reformed Church, and we take this opportunity of expressing our entire disapproval of any such innovation, and our firm determination to do all in our power to discourage it."

In the same year, 1873, a Report of the Committee of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was presented by Archbishop Tait. We give this, every sentence of which is of the deepest importance.

"In the matter of confession, the Church of England holds fast those principles which are set forth in Holy Scripture, which were affirmed by the Primitive Church, and which were re-affirmed by the English Reformation. The Church of England, in the 25th Article, affirms that Penance is not to be counted a sacrament of the Gospel; and, as judged by her formularies, knows no such words as "Sacramental Confessions." Grounding her doctrines on Holy Scripture, she distinctly declares the full and entire forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Jesus Christ, to those who bewail their own sinfulness, and confess themselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life, and turn with true faith unto Him. It is the desire of the Church that by this way and means all her children should find peace. In this

spirit the forms of confession and absolution are set forth in her public services. Yet, for the relief of troubled consciences, she has made special provision in two exceptional cases. (1) In the case of those who cannot quiet their own consciences previous to receiving the Holy Communion, but require further comfort and counsel, the minister is directed to say, 'Let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice.' Nevertheless, it is to be noted that for such a case no form of absolution has been prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer; and further, that the Rubric in the first Prayer Book of 1549, which sanctions a particular form of absolution, has been withdrawn from all subsequent editions of the said book. (2) In the Order of the Visitation of the Sick, it is directed, that the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter, but in such case absolution is to be given when the sick man shall humbly and heartily desire it. The special provision, however, does not authorise the ministers of the Church to require from any who may repair to them to open their griefs in a particular or detailed examination of all their sins, or to require private confession as a condition previous to receiving the Holy Communion, or to enjoin or even encourage any practice of habitual confession to a priest."

Such is the voice of the Church of England as declared by her Prayer Book, her Homilies, and her archbishops. In the face of all this we ask, Are those who advocate the practice of secret and habitual confession to a priest true and loyal churchmen?

The following opinions of representative Churchmen uphold the teaching of our Church.

Richard Hooker devotes several pages in discussing the subjects of confession and absolution, and quotes largely from the Fathers. The following sentences indicate his views. After quoting, amongst other passages, one from Chrysostom :—"Let the inquiry and presentment of thy offences be made in thine own thoughts; let the tribunal whereat thou arraignest thyself be without witness; let God

and only God see thee and thy confession,"—Hooker proceeds :—"To conclude, we everywhere find the use of confession, especially public, allowed of and commended by the Fathers; but that extreme and rigorous necessity of auricular and private confession, which is at this day so mightily upheld by the Church of Rome, we find not." —(*Book* vi., c. iv., s. 14). After speaking of public and private confession in various Churches, Hooker says:— "In regard thereof the Church of England hitherto hath thought it the safer way to refer men's hidden sins unto God and themselves only; howbeit, not without special caution for the admonition of such as come to the holy Sacrament, and for the comfort of such as are ready to depart the world."—(*Book* vi., c. iv., s. 15). And again :—"What then is the force of absolution? Doth it by any operation derived from itself alter the state of the soul? Doth it really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon? The latter of which two is our assertion, the former the Papists'."—*Book* vi., c. vi., s. 4.

The late Bishop Blomfield (London), said in a Charge delivered in 1842, "auricular confession was utterly unknown to the Primitive Church, one of the most fearful abuses of that of Rome, and the source of unspeakable abominations."

Bishop Harold Browne (Winchester), speaking in Convocation in May, 1873, said—"I am sorry to say I am personally cognisant of two or three most grievous results that I can only allude to in a general form, through young women having chosen young men by their own free choice as their confessors."

Bishop Walsham How writes :—"We believe that *enforced* confession, as in the Roman Church, is an evil of gigantic magnitude. We believe that *habitual* confession, however voluntary, would be generally an enervating and unwholesome practice. Its tendency is to become unreal and formal, or, if real and honest, to divest the soul of that sense of personal responsibility of judgment in moral and spiritual things which God has laid upon it, and to destroy its true manliness and self-dependence. Moreover, it is right to add, that had habitual private confession been the practice of the Apostolic Church, it is inconceivable that distinct and unmistakable

traces of it should not appear in the inspired Epistles as well as in those of the Apostolic fathers."—*Private Life and Ministrations of the Parish Priest,* pp. 47, 48.

Dean Vaughan writes :—"We will venture to say that neither Scripture, nor our Church's teaching, gives the slightest encouragement to that sort of systematic and habitual confession, the periodical carrying to a priest of the secrets of the conscience and of the life, which had its natural place among the many errors of Romanism, and which some would bring back in these days into the bosom of a Reformed and Protestant Church . . . There are two cases—two only—in which this Church of England has bidden her ministers to ask for the intimate confidences of her children. One of these is in reference to the Sacrament of Holy Communion. The other is in reference to great sickness. But the very exceptions prove the rule. The Church, which in these two special cases advises and encourages by her silence, in other cases seems rather to dissuade. In fact, the dangers of perpetual confession are greater than its benefits."—*Liturgy and Worship of the Church*, pp. 67-69.

We believe in confession and proclaim the benefits of absolution. Man is a sinner. Confession of sin must go before forgiveness. Indeed, it is, as a rule, necessary to salvation. True repentance must accompany confession. To whom is this confession to be made? It matters not what Councils have ordained, nor yet what antiquity practised. The point is, "What saith the Scripture?" We know that Achan confessed to Joshua, as also did David to Nathan. These were God's servants, but neither of them was a priest. We search the Scriptures in vain for any single passage which commands or sanctions habitual confession of sin to an earthly priest. As ministers we have no power to absolve from sin. We declare a Divine fact—God's forgiveness to all that truly repent. We cannot forgive whom God has not forgiven.

We have a great High Priest! By Him we have access to the Father, "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii. 1, 2). The intervention of earthly priests is not needed. To confess to sinful men

of like passions with ourselves can bring no relief. To practice habitual confession to a priest is "to cringe for favours at the feet of a servant when we may go boldly to the Master." Yea, more, it is to dishonour the Gospel of Christ. There is no need to confess to a priest. No Scripture warrant can be produced for the practice. No good can result from it. God, and God alone, can confer forgiveness. Every penitent soul who confesses to Him, and forsakes sin, shall hear the still small voice of true and full absolution :—"Son, daughter, thy sins are forgiven thee, go, and sin no more." "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." May it be ours to confess as did David, then like him we shall receive perfect absolution—*perfect* because *divine.* "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper : but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy" (Prov. xxviii. 13). "I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions UNTO THE LORD ; AND THOU FORGAVEST the iniquity of my sin."—*Psalm* xxxii. 5.

O Lord, we beseech Thee, absolve Thy people from their offences ; that through Thy bountiful goodness we may all be delivered from the bands of those sins, which by our frailty we have committed : Grant this, O heavenly Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

Jehovah—Father, Spirit, Son—
Mysterious Godhead, Three in One,
Before Thy throne we sinners bend,
Grace, pardon, life to us extend."

NOTE ON CONFESSION.

The following weighty words formed part of an address given by Bishop S. Wilberforce to his rural deans in July, 1873, four days before his death. He said:—"Great prominence is given to the subject of CONFESSION. The tendency of the doctrine now put forward on this subject is to exalt its use into a necessity of the Christian life. Now, I have no doubt in my own mind what is the true teaching of the Church of England on this point. It is, that Christ has lodged with His Church the power of Absolution by Word, the Sacraments, and the Ministry: these are the ordinary means of relieving the sins and sorrows of His people, and conveying the assurance of pardon to the penitent. Then, in particular cases, for souls specially burdened with sin, besides this primary doctrine laid down and insisted upon by our great Reformers, there is a direction to make particular Confession as the mode of obtaining relief. But this is an essentially different doctrine from that which it is now sought to establish, viz., that habitual Confession is almost necessary for the leading of the higher Christian life. This leads on rapidly to the old habit of believing that private Confession of sin before the great High Priest is insufficient; and that without Confession to a priest, a man cannot be sure of pardon, and especially cannot draw near to God in the Holy Sacrament. Now this system of Confession is one of the worst developments of Popery. In the first place, as regards the penitent, it is a system of unnatural excitement, a sort of spiritual dram-drinking, fraught with evil to the whole spiritual constitution. It is nothing short of the renunciation of the great charge of a conscience which God has committed to every man—the substitution of Confession to man for the opening of the heart to God—the adopting in every case of a remedy only adapted to extreme cases which can find relief in no other way. Then, in *families* it introduces untold mischief. It supersedes God's appointment of intimacy between husband and wife, father and children: substituting another influence for that which ought to be the nearest and closest, and

producing reserve and estrangement where there ought to be perfect freedom and openness. Lastly, as regards *the priest* to whom Confession is made, it brings in a wretched system of casuistry. But, far worse than this, it necessitates the terrible evil of familiar dealing with sin, specially with sins of uncleanness . . . so poisoning the mind of priest and people alike."—*Burgon's Twelve Good Men*, vol. ii. p. 54.

Prayer for the Dead.

"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord."

ENDEAVOURS are being made to introduce into the Church of England the custom of prayer for the departed, on the ground that it was a primitive practice, and one not condemned by our Church. This is one of the fruits of the "Tracts for the Times," which taught that there is an intermediate state in which the souls of the faithful are purified and grow in grace, and that such souls are benefited by our prayers, and by the offering of the Holy Communion on their behalf. (See Tract 79, *On Purgatory*, by J. H. Newman.)

This doctrine may have the authority of antiquity, but we must remember that primitive practice is no guarantee for purity of doctrine. Bishop Jeremy Taylor tells us that the ancient heathen prayed for their dead. The example of St. Augustine praying for his departed mother, the godly Monica, is often quoted. True he did so pray, but it was not for any need his sainted mother had, for she was with Christ as he himself says in his "*Confessions*:"—"Of this we were assured by the testimony of her life, her faith unfeigned, and on grounds which admitted of no doubt" (Chap. xii.) Reading the whole passage as given in the *Confessions*, it is more of a Thanksgiving for the departed than a prayer. Says Bishop Morton (writing A.D. 1610):—"The prayers for the dead, made by the ancients, were only thankful testimonies for their present joys, or else testimonies

of their hopes and desires of their future resurrection and consummation of their blessedness, both in body and soul."—*Catholic Appeal.*

We give the following facts in proof of our statement, that determined efforts are being made to establish this Romish practice in the Church of England:—

The "*English Catholic's Vade Mecum*," already mentioned, contains forms of prayer for the departed, one of which commences—"Absolve, O Lord, we beseech Thee, the soul of Thy servant," etc. There are in some parishes branches of the guild of All Souls, of which one of the obligations of membership is—"The recitation, on a fixed day once a week, of three short collects for the dying and faithful departed, and on the last Saturday of each month, of the Litany of the faithful departed."

In August, 1882, the preacher at Holy Nativity Church, Knowle, Bristol, just prior to the sermon, invited the congregation to pray for the repose of the soul of the late Dr. Pusey, and announced that a sacrifice on his behalf would be offered on the following Friday.

Early in 1883 might be seen, in the Church of St. Bartholomew, Brighton, a written request for prayer for the late Archbishop Tait, and in February of the same year, the present writer saw, in the same Church, a notice requesting prayers for six persons recently departed, whose names were appended.

In March, 1883, the Rector of Coppenhall, Cheshire, hearing of the death of his predecessor—a faithful evangelical minister—fixed a memorial card on the notice board of the Church, headed—"Of thy mercy, pray for the repose of the soul of the Rev. J. B. Wheeler. R. I. P."

In the *Church Times* of June 1st, 1883, is a lengthy report of the tenth anniversary of the Guild of All Souls, held in Croydon, under the presidency of the Rev. A. Tooth, who, in his opening address, said—"Prayer becoming more fully recognised, the churches were opened, and, *with this, had come prayer for the holy dead.* And so also, in regard to the Holy Communion, it had come to be regarded, not only as a means of grace, but also as a most beautiful form of intercession for the living *and the dead.*" Another clergyman, W. H. Browne, pleaded for funds for a chapel, saying—

"The chapel would soon be a home for this devotion for which the guild existed: it would be the place where the Holy Sacrifice would be offered frequently, and soon, he hoped daily; so that there would be daily, from that one altar, the great intercession for those who were departed. They hoped, by and by, to procure consecrated oil, with which to anoint the dying."

That the attempt to revive Masses for the dead is a determined one will be seen from the following extracts from the *Church Times*, of April 20th, 1883:—"The funeral of R—— A——, took place at St. Faith's Church, Stoke Newington, on Friday, at 7.30 a.m. The Service consisted of the former part of the Burial Service, *followed by a High Celebration*, etc. The funeral of the Rev. H. —— was at eight o'clock, the Celebration being between the two parts of the Burial Service. The Rev. —— was celebrant, and we need hardly say that the Service was thoroughly Catholic." Each of the above paragraphs closes with R.I.P.

It is difficult to realise that we are writing of present day practices in the Church of England, but such is the fact.

Prayer for the dead is closely allied with the doctrine of purgatory, is directly opposed to the letter and spirit of the Gospel, and is contrary to the teaching of our Church. Bishop Jewel says:—"Praying for the dead is superstitious, and without warrant of God's word" (*Works* ii., p. 743). Bishop Jeremy Taylor writes:—"Concerning prayer for the dead, the Church hath received no commandment from the Lord; and therefore concerning it we can have no rules nor proportions, but from the imperfect revelations of the state of departed souls, and the measures of charity which can relate only to the imperfection of their present condition, and the terrors of the day of judgment; but to think that any suppletory (*supplying of deficiencies*) to an evil life can be taken from such devotions after the sinners are dead may encourage a bad man to sin, but cannot relieve him when he hath."—*Dedication to Holy Dying.*

Bishop Morton says:—"We are justly stayed from performing any such kindness, which, instead of showing love unto the dead, might seduce the living with *deceivable hopes of succour after their death.*"—*Catholic Appeal*, A.D. 1610.

In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI., 1552, all prayer for the dead was deliberately omitted. In the Homilies, our Church in clear language condemns the practice thus :—"Now to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world or no? Wherein, if we will cleave only unto the Word of God, then must we needs grant that we have no commandment so to do. [Here follow quotations from Luke xvi. 19-26; Matt. v. 26; John iii. 36; Eccles. xi. 3, etc.] Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers; but as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption. . . . Let us not therefore dream either of purgatory or prayer for the souls of them that be dead, but let us earnestly and diligently pray for them which are expressly commanded in Holy Scripture, namely, for kings and rulers, for ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful, to be short, for all men living."—*Homily on Prayer*, Part iii.

In the Communion Service *prayer* is made for the Church Militant *on earth*, and *thanksgiving* offered for the *faithful* departed.

Such is the Scriptural teaching of the Church of England. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." They are with Christ, beyond the need of human prayers. For those who die without Christ we have no commandment to pray, nor does the Word of God give the slightest grounds for supposing that any such prayer, if made, will be answered. On the contrary, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi.) declares that between the spirits of those who die in the Lord and those who pass away impenitent there is an eternal separation, a chasm too wide to be bridged over by human prayer, "Between you and us there is a great gulf fixed, so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." As the *Commination Service* solemnly

says :—"Then it shall be too late to knock when the door shall be shut: and too late to cry for mercy when it is the time of justice."

The Scriptures do not give any warrant whatever for offering prayer for the dead. The passage often quoted—2 Tim. i. 18—where St. Paul prays for his friend Onesiphorus, is claimed in support of prayer for the dead. There is not, however, the slightest evidence to show that Onesiphorus was dead. The probability is that he was absent from his family. Bishop Wordsworth, in his Greek Testament, says :—"It has been inferred from chap. iv. 19, where the *household* of Onesiphorus is saluted, that Onesiphorus was now *dead*; and that the present wish for *him* is therefore a prayer for the *dead*. But, not to dwell on the circumstance that it cannot justly be called a *prayer*, it is probable that St. Paul knew that Onesiphorus was *not now* at Ephesus. Indeed he seems to be now at Rome" (v. 17).

The passage from the Apocryphal Book of Second Maccabees (xii., 43-45), which states that Judas "made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin" needs only to be named that it may be dismissed by the comment of Bishop Wordsworth, who says :—"This book is no part of canonical Scripture; and the opinions of men, however brave, are not to be received as a guide to our conduct, and to be placed on a level with the commands of God."

We believe that to introduce the practice of prayer for the dead would be to pave the way for some of the worst errors of the Church of Rome, which Church, to use Cranmer's words, "devised a purgatory to torment souls after this life, and oblations of masses said by the priest, to deliver them."

Prayer for those who have departed this life in the faith and fear of God is in direct opposition to the spirit of the beautiful words of our Church in the Burial Service :—

"Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity," etc.

We conclude, then, that the practice of prayer for the dead is opposed to the Scriptures; contrary to the doctrines

of the Church of England, and inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel of Christ. "Blessed—happy—are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."

"For all Thy saints who from their labours rest,
Who Thee by faith before the world confest,
Thy name, O Jesus, be for ever blest!
Hallelujah!

"O blest communion, fellowship divine!
We feebly struggle, *they* in glory shine;
Yet all are one in Thee, for all are Thine.
Hallelujah!"

Church and State.

"Blessed is the Nation whose God is the LORD."

IN a preceding chapter the Church of England is characterised as a NATIONAL Church, and attempts to sever the existing union between Church and State are briefly indicated (see p. 42). It is needful that something more should be said on this, one of the great questions of the day. The Atheist very naturally clamours for the severance of the union; the programme of the "Freethinkers" demands "that our entire political system shall be founded and administered on a clearly secular basis, and especially that the use of the Bible in the public schools shall be prohibited." A section of Nonconformity, represented by the Liberation Society, and actuated mainly by political considerations, demands disestablishment and disendowment. The Ritualists, desirous of more freedom, once formed a League, with the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie as President, "to promote the disestablishment of the Church of England" (see p. 9). The loyal Churchman is prepared to uphold and strengthen the union, believing that there is nothing in it unjust or unholy, but that, on the contrary, it is a blessing to the nation, and enables the Church to exercise a wider and deeper influence for good.

Let us define our terms. By *Church* in this chapter is meant the Church of England—or, as it is called in an Act of Parliament (5 Anne, cap. 5), "the true Protestant

religion—the Church of this Kingdom as now by law established." By *State* is intended the civil power—the governing power of the nation, which of course represents the whole Commonwealth. It is very difficult to separate and define our ideas of Church and State. Each has its own sphere of action; their proper adjustment powerfully affects the happiness of mankind. Even the heathen Plutarch said: "You might more easily build a city in the air than give permanence to a State without a religion." It is the grand end of the Church to establish truth and virtue, to Christianise and make happy the people, and so to exalt the nation. Yet some hold that civil government and religion have nothing to do with each other. Surely the Divine declaration that "Righteousness exalteth a nation" implies a very different principle!

"My Kingdom is not of this world," a text quoted again and again in Nonconformist pulpits and on Liberation platforms in support of the disestablishment movement, has no relation whatever to the subject. By it our Lord meant that His Kingdom was of Divine, not of earthly origin; that it differed in nature from the kingdoms of earth, and that the weapons of Christian warfare were spiritual, not carnal. To say that the rulers of this world should have nothing to do with the Church of Christ, is to assert what is directly opposed to both the letter and the spirit of Holy Scripture. "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers" (Isa. xlix. 23). This is said of the spiritual Israel—the Church Catholic. Bishop Ryle writes thus on our Lord's words:—"The favourite theory of certain Christians that this text (John xviii. 36) forbids Governments to have anything to do with religion, and condemns the union of Church and State, and renders all Established Churches unlawful, is, in my judgment, baseless, preposterous, and utterly devoid of common-sense. Whether the union of Church and State be right or wrong, it appears to me absurd to say that it is forbidden by this text. The text declares that Christ's Kingdom did not spring from the powers of this world, and is not dependent on them; but the text does not declare that the powers of this world ought to have nothing to do with Christ's Kingdom."—(*Com. on St. John.*)

Churchmen have varied in their theories of the relationship of Church and State. *Dr. Paley* took comparatively low ground, that of the utilitarian, saying that "the authority of a Church Establishment is founded only on its utility: and whenever on this principle we deliberate concerning the form, propriety, or comparative excellency of particular Establishments, the single view under which we ought to consider any of them is that of a *scheme of instruction;* the single end which we ought to propose by them is the preservation and communication of religious knowledge." —(*Moral and Political Philosophy*, B. vi. c. 10.) Bishop *Warburton* deals with the subject from a much higher standpoint. He writes:—"The State contemplates for its end the body and its interests; has for its means, coercion; for its general subject matter, utility. The Church is a religious society of distinct origin: having for its end, the salvation of souls; for its subject matter, truth; for its instrument, persuasion; regulating motives as well as acts, and promising eternal reward. Though separate, the societies would not interfere, because they have different provinces; but the State having needs (the control of motives, etc.), and the Church wanting protection against violence, they have each reasons sufficient for a voluntary and free convention. Accordingly, the societies united, not, indeed, under any formal engagement, with all the stipulated conditions; but like sovereign and people in the original contract."—(*Alliance of Church and State.*) *Richard Hooker's* theory of Church and State, which can scarcely be said to represent the existing order of things, is this:—"There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the Commonwealth; nor any man a member of the Commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England."—(*Eccl. Polity*, Bk. viii. c. 1, s. 3.) Hooker reasoned thus from the analogy of the Jewish Church and nation. It is thought that his theory here is not the actual *identity* of Church and Commonwealth, but rather that the Church is the entire body of its members, and not merely the rulers or heads of it, and that the Church and the Commonwealth are composed of the same members. He, however, clearly distinguished between the two thus:—"A Church and a Commonwealth, we grant, are in nature the one distinguished from

the other." To understand clearly the position taken by Hooker, all Book viii. of his *Eccl. Polity* should be read. The following statement by this great writer cannot well be disproved:—"We agree that pure and unstained religion ought to be the highest of all cares appertaining to public regimen; as well in regard of that aid and protection which they who faithfully serve God confess they receive at His merciful hands; as also for the force which religion hath to qualify all sorts of men, and to make them in public affairs the more serviceable, governors the apter to rule with conscience, inferiors for conscience sake the willinger to obey. For if the course of politic affairs cannot in any good sort go forward without fit instruments, and that which fitteth them be their virtues, let Polity acknowledge itself indebted to Religion."—(Book v. chap. 1, s. 2.)

The Church of England is often referred to as "the Establishment," a very misleading term, which lends colour to what many think, viz., that the Church was established and endowed at the Reformation. Looking at the matter from an historical and legal standpoint, there is no such thing as *the Establishment*. Prior to the Reformation, the regulation of the faith, ceremonies, and discipline of the Church of England was exclusively dealt with by the ecclesiastical authorities, the spiritual supremacy of the Pope being then acknowledged. "But (writes Dr. Stephens in his edition of Blackstone) at the era of the Reformation it was found necessary to resort to the legislature, for an authoritative exposition of the true Protestant faith, for the *establishment* of appropriate forms of worship, and for a declaration of the Crown's supremacy, in lieu of that of the Pope, in matters ecclesiastical; and from this time the power of the ecclesiastical authorities has been exercised in subordination to these paramount institutions of the civil government."—(*Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Edit. vii., Vol. 2, p. 702.)

The sense in which the Church of England is established is accurately expressed thus in the Royal assent to the Canons of 1604:—"The present estate and government of the Church of England by the laws of this our realm now settled and established." The Church at the Reformation was *reformed*. No new Church was established.

Professor Freeman, in his work on "Disestablishment," after reviewing certain events of the sixteenth century, writes:—"It is certain that no English ruler, no English Parliament thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of reforming the existing English Church. . . . They were getting rid of innovations and corruptions; they were casting off an usurped foreign jurisdiction, and restoring to the Crown its ancient authority over the State Ecclesiastical. . . . There was no one moment, no one Act of Parliament, when and by which a Church was 'established'; still less was there any Act by which one Church was disestablished and another Church 'established' in its place" (p. 39). A well-known Congregationalist—*Dr. E. R. Conder*—acknowledges that "in England, in one form or another, the alliance of Church and State is older than Parliament, older than the Courts of Justice, older than trial by jury, older than the Monarchy itself." (*Ecclesia*, p. 207.)

It is most important that this historical aspect of the case should be remembered, inasmuch as it cuts much of the ground from under those who demand disestablishment and disendowment.

This leads us to the subject of Church property, and here we cannot do better than quote again from *Stephens'* Blackstone:—"The endowments and provisions of the Church consist of lands, advowsons, and tithes; all of which have been at different times annexed to ecclesiastical preferments by the munificence of ancient or modern donors. . . . . The establishment of tithes in the Christian Church is generally ascribed to the fourth century, though we cannot precisely ascertain the time when they were first introduced into this country. Possibly they were contemporary with the planting of Christianity among the Saxons by Augustine the monk, about the end of the sixth century. But the first mention of them, perhaps, in any written law, is in a decree made in a synod held A.D. 786" (Vol. 2, pp. 712, 723).

It is desirable that Churchmen should have some knowledge of the important body called the *Ecclesiastical Commission*. In 1835 Royal Commissioners were appointed to consider Cathedral and other Church revenues, and to

devise such measures as might conduce to the increased efficiency of the Church. In 1836 these Commissioners became a corporation, with perpetual succession and a common seal. This corporation now includes all the Bishops of England and Wales, several of the Judges, the Deans of Canterbury, Westminster, and St. Paul's, and a few appointed lay Churchmen. It exists for the purpose of holding, managing, adjusting, and distributing the property and revenues of the Church. One very special part of its work is the making provision for populous districts. All Churches before consecration and all Vicarage-houses are legally conveyed to the Commissioners. Very large private benefactions are every year paid to the Commissioners. For example, during 42 years—1840-1882—the amount of *private* benefactions paid to meet the Commissioners' grants for the augmentation and endowment of benefices was £4,050,000. And yet the Liberation Society says that these funds are not for the adherents of the Church, but *for England*, and seriously proposes that part of it should be devoted to education—the maintenance of the poor—sanitary improvements—the reduction of the national debt—local objects, etc. (See *Case for Disestablishment*, *Liberation Society*, 1884.) Details of the work of the Ecclesiastical Commission will be found in the *Official Year Book of the Church* for 1884—details which mark the growth and stability of the Church of England, and the munificent liberality of her members.

Doubtless much of the agitation against the Church of England is due to political feeling. We sometimes hear that "social disparagement" is caused by the State recognition of religion, but can scarcely think that this sentimental grievance has much weight with thoughtful men. To say, as some do, that "the Established Church is simply a branch of the Civil Service," that the clergy of the Church "are State paid," that they "live of the taxes ill-spared from the hard earnings of the poor," are misrepresentations of the grossest kind. It will be readily admitted, that misuse of ecclesiastical property calls for reform, but this can hardly be regarded as a valid cause for spoliation and confiscation.

The position and intentions of the Liberation Society are indicated by the following resolution proposed to be moved

in the Parliament of 1884 :—"That the Establishment of the Church of England by law, imposes upon Parliament duties which it cannot effectually discharge ; deprives the Church of the power of managing her own affairs ; inflicts injustice on a large section of the community ; and is injurious to the political and religious interests of the nation ; and therefore it ought to be no longer maintained." The report of the Society for 1884 shows that the subscriptions and donations for the year to further the work of disestablishment were £6,525. How much better for all concerned had this large sum been applied in augmentation of the stipends of the poor dissenting ministers, so often referred to by Mr. Spurgeon, who says that he has been "asked repeatedly to send students to spheres where £40 is mentioned as if it were competence, if not more" (*Sword and Trowel*, vol. iii. p. 17). In the said *Case for Disestablishment* the Liberation Society makes the following assertions :—"State Churches are inconsistent with the nature of religion and with the teaching of the Old Testament, and incompatible with the teaching of Christ and His Apostles ; have hindered rather than helped the cause of religion ; fail to embody the gracious and loving spirit of the Gospel. Establishment of religion injures the Churches established—(*a*) Fetters their free action, (*b*) lowers their spiritual tone, (*c*) begets a spirit of exclusiveness, (*d*) discourages liberality. State Churches necessarily involve injustice—are hostile to liberty—opposed to progress."

It is easy to make statements like these, but the answer to them is by no means difficult. By presenting a one-sided view, and withholding certain facts, similar assertions might be made of Nonconformist societies. The statements of the agents of the Liberation Society painfully remind us of Tennyson's lines :—

> "That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies.
> That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
> But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight."

Take, *e.g.*, the statement that the establishment of the Church discourages the liberality of its members. Is this true of the Church of England? Are Churchmen less liberal than Nonconformists? Let the point be decided by

undeniable facts. The sums given to Church, Educational, and Missionary objects, as set forth in preceding pages (41–41*b*) furnish a complete answer to this unfounded charge. *The Official Year Book of the Church of England* for 1884 (amongst many other proofs of the liberality of Churchmen), devotes several pages to the statistics of "Hospital Sunday" in London and in the provinces, from which it appears that in London, during the ten years ending 1883, the Church of England contributed £223,339, whilst the total contributed by Nonconformists, Roman Catholics, etc., was £77,431. In the provinces, in five years (1879-1883), Church collections amounted to £129,049; those of the Nonconformists, Roman Catholics, etc., to £71,339. These facts are cited not boastingly, but in defence of the Church of England. The insinuation that the spiritual tone of Churchmen is lower than that of Nonconformists, is, we are sure, one which the great majority of Nonconformists would not make. Much more might be said concerning the "golden fetters of the State;" and also of the vaunted "freedom in bonds," which paradox (says a dissenting minister in the *Record*, Nov. 21, 1884) is often "painfully conspicuous within the four walls of our Nonconformist Churches." On these and other important points we would refer the reader to "The Dead Hand in the Free Churches," and "The Englishman's Brief for his National Church" (S. P. C. K.), both by the Rev. Thos. Moore. In the latter, prominence is given to the following points:—(*a*) That it does not appear from the Old or New Testament record, that the union between Church and State is contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture, or of Christ or His Apostles. (*b*) That the union between Church and State is not the result of a deliberately formulated theory, but is the outcome of their gradual mutual growth and inter-dependence during the long course of centuries. (*c*) That in this way the Church, in the early period of Christian history in this country, became established, and therefore was never established by Act of Parliament. (*d*) That her endowments were never in whole or in part derived from the State, but were of private origin, the free gifts of individual members. (*e*) That as such they are not national, but corporate property, vested in thousands of separate corporations, for

the spiritual benefit of the populations of dioceses and parishes, and as such cannot in justice be dealt with by the State, otherwise than as it deals with the property of other corporations in the country.

The early Nonconformists did not object to the connection of the Church with the State, and we confidently believe that the words of the pious and learned Matthew Henry represent not only the opinion of leading Nonconformists of the past, but also that of a great number of those of the present day, including nearly the whole of the great Wesleyan body. That well-known Independent says:—"Let us give God praise for the National Establishment of our religion, with that of our peace and civil liberty; that the Reformation was in our land a national act; and that religion, thus purified, is supported by good and wholesome laws, and is twisted in with the very constitution of our government."

It is noticeable that Liberationists speak of the Queen as "Head of the Church" in a sense altogether opposed to the proper meaning of the term as set forth by Article XXXVII. of our Church, which explains it as "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal." That this royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters affects Nonconformists and Roman Catholics as well as Churchmen is evident from the Hewley case, the O'Keefe case, the Saurin Convent case, and the Stannard case. The latter case, reported in the *Times* of February 2nd, 1881, clearly proves that all dissenting Churches are subject to the jurisdiction of the civil courts, and that the creed of any non-established Church may be considered, and its true interpretation decided, by the Civil Court.

The Liberationists complain of the disabilities to which Dissenters are subject. Bishop Ryle in his Charge (1884) answers this complaint thus:—"There are no people who are so entirely free from disabilities, and enjoy such a large measure of freedom, as English Nonconformists. They have a perfect plethora of liberty; they may build where they please, preach what they please, worship God in any

way that they please, without anyone interfering. There is hardly an avenue to distinction in any profession, or to the highest offices under the Crown, which is not open to them as well as to Churchmen. What would they have? They tell us in reply that they want perfect religious equality! . . . A dissolution of the union of Church and State would certainly not procure it."

Not a few who strive for disestablishment speak disparagingly of our Articles, Creeds, and Liturgy. To many a "Free Church" is a Church without any definite creed. It is a simple matter of fact that hundreds of Dissenting Churches, which once held orthodox views, have lapsed into Unitarianism. Congregationalism, as a system, is, we believe, quite incapable of long preserving, or of perpetuating unimpaired, the grand principles of the Christian faith.*

We believe the existing union of Church and State to be in agreement with Scripture, and of untold advantage to this realm of England. Not only does it secure general respect for religion, but it guarantees in a way which nothing else can the Protestant succession to the Crown of England. As a national testimony of faith in God it is worth preserving. Its maintenance is not a mere question of policy, but a solemn duty imposed upon all Churchmen.

The National Church has those defects and shortcomings which seem inseparable from all earthly institutions. These her members not only admit and deplore, but earnestly strive to remedy. We have to do with actual facts, and not with a mere ideal Church which exists only in dreamland. The cry of some persons is, "A Free Church in a Free State." What they mean is not easy to say. To us a far nobler watchword is, "A Christian Church in a Christian State." Churchmen are quite as ready as Nonconformists "to render to Cæsar the things that are

* Mr. Spurgeon, reviewing Dr. Dale's *Manual of Congregational Principles*, says:—"No doubt an admirable exposition of Congregational principles; but we are grieved to see in it the evidences of a general unsettledness and change in the Independent body. The doctrines of the body would seem to be in a gelatinous condition, and backbone is out of the question."—(*Sword and Trowel*, Dec., 1884.)

Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." The Church derives its great commission direct from God, and not from the State. To the Churchman, obedience to the Sovereign must ever be conditioned by obedience to God.

It is important that Churchmen should emphasise the fact so earnestly insisted upon by the late Dean McNeile, viz.: "That the English Church as a Christian society has plainly announced those doctrines which it is her determination to teach. The State may give or withhold countenance and support to her whilst so teaching. But it is grossly untrue to say that the State dictates or has power to dictate a single article of her faith.* It is altogether untrue that the State governs or has power to govern any minister of the Church of England, to act in opposition to the Word of God."—(*The Church and the Churches.*)

Whilst we seek to defend the Church of England from her opponents, and to maintain a union which we believe to be of vital importance to the prosperity of this country, we would not forget that we live in days of change and unrest. And whilst striving in the strength of God to do our duty, we would comfort ourselves with the thought so happily expressed by Archbishop Thomson:—"Were the Church of England to be rejected now by the nation as the National Church, the imperishable truth would remain with her, and would not be silenced—no, not for an hour."

It is well that Englishmen of all classes should consider this great question of Church and State in all its bearings. The warning words of one of the leaders of the Free Church of Scotland—Lord Moncrieff—should be pondered well by all who desire the separation of Church and State:—"It must not be forgotten," he says, "that changes of this nature are seldom confined in their operation to the object for which they were effected, but frequently find their main development in results the most unexpected, and sometimes in those which are least desired. It is impossible to root out an old tree without disturbing the soil around it; and the abolition of the Established Church would bring with it

* The Liberation Society misrepresents the case by saying that "The State controls the clergy of the Established Church by declaring what they must believe and teach."—*Case for Disestablishment*, p. 51.

many results, religious, public, and social, extending far beyond our subjects of controversy."

No apology is needed for concluding this chapter with eloquent and stirring words from the late Dean Stanley's *Essays on Church and State* (p. 290) :—"The necessary imperfections of the connection of Church and State I have freely allowed. Like every human institution, it may be doomed to destruction, and to be succeeded by something better than itself. It may fall, as a relic of the past, with all the other old institutions of England—the Monarchy, the Aristocracy, the mysterious 'Constitution' itself. It may be that we shall live to see the triumph of the triple alliance between the descendants of the Puritans, the descendants of Rousseau, and the descendants of Laud. It may be that we shall see this venerable growth of English history uprooted, the parochial system swept away, the National Church divided into fragments, the cathedral and parish churches closed, Westminster Abbey sold to the first chance purchaser for what its stones are worth; the Episcopalian clergy left to the tender mercies of irresponsible bishops; the Presbyterian clergy to the equally irresponsible tribunals of Presbyteries and General Assemblies; the nation at large cut off from any control over the greatest and most sacred of all its interests; the true voice of the laity and of the Church silenced in its greatest and most powerful organ; the nation ceasing to recognise the loftiest and purest of all the missions entrusted to it. This, and nothing less than this, will be a true and complete separation of Church and State. This may be, and out of this chaos our children may be called laboriously to construct a new order of things. But, till the fatal hour be come, I, for one, am prepared (as an American bishop, impressed with the evils of his own system, recently urged us) 'to fight for our present Constitution to the moral death.' Let us reform, enlarge, ease the system as much as we can; but let us not, without a struggle, consent to see this backbone of the English Church and Commonwealth broken to pieces. Let us not rashly part with the framework which, with all its faults, has sheltered, down to this time, what has been truly called 'the learning of the most learned, the freedom of the freest, and the reason of the most rational Church in Christendom.'"

The Book of Common Prayer.

"Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His courts with praise."

THE English Book of Common Prayer may be justly regarded as an unimpeachable witness to the discreet wisdom and Scriptural principles of our Reformers. It has existed in its present form for more than three hundred years, during which period it has been used and loved by vast numbers of devout Christians.

Next to the Bible, the loyal Churchman looks to and values his Prayer Book. Some one has happily said, that "the Bible is the gracious means whereby God speaks to us, and the Prayer Book the mouthpiece through which we speak to God." "Let it not be thought (writes Dean Burgon) that we confound things human with things divine —the Prayer Book with the Bible. The Bible must ever be enshrined apart."

One prominent feature of the Prayer Book is indicated by the word *common*. It is used by and serves for "all sorts and conditions of men." Common prayer, as distinguished from private prayer, is prayer in which *all* unite. So in the prayer of St. Chrysostom in the daily services:— "Almighty God, who hast given us grace at this time to make our *common* supplications unto Thee," etc.

Liturgical forms of worship have come down from very early times. Like many other good things, they have often

been objected to.* Some have urged that a form of prayer is unnatural and lifeless, that it cramps the free expression of the heart, and tends to spiritual coldness and poverty. The general experience of the Christian Church for many centuries completely overthrows these objections. It has been rightly observed that if a Prayer Book in the hands of a worshipper is unfavourable to spiritual worship, a hymn-book should be equally so.

The Prayer Book has come down to us through the ages, and bears the twofold seal of antiquity and apostolic truth. "The English Prayer Book (Bishop Barry writes) embodies in tangible form the chief principles of the English Reformation. It was no new book, drawn up by the religious leaders of the 16th century, but was mainly a reformed re-publication of those old services, which had grown up through nearly a thousand years of English Christianity, being themselves developments of the liturgies of an even remoter antiquity."—*(Introduction to Teacher's Prayer Book.)*

Let us now take a very brief survey of the history of the Prayer Book, remembering (with Dean Burgon) that "it exhibits the accumulated wisdom not of a single age or country, but of all the ages. It is not a legacy bequeathed to us by our own forefathers alone; but an inheritance which we derive from the whole of Christendom. The East has contributed her purest traditions; the West has enshrined them in a casket of her wisest contriving; and piety has gathered up the gems of the holiest utterance wherever syllabled, careful only to conceal the blessed speaker's name. . . . In all its essential outlines, it has been the consolation of GOD'S people, of our fathers, and of our fathers' fathers, for more than a thousand years."

* Nonconformists have varied much in their estimate of liturgical forms of devotion. The Rev. C. H. Spurgeon seeks to show the superiority of extempore prayer, and says, "the introduction of Liturgies amongst Nonconformists would mark the era of our decline and fall."—(*Lectures to Students.* First Series, p. 55.) It is, however, a fact that liturgical forms of worship are now very largely used by Nonconformist congregations. At the present time there is advertised:—*The Book of Offices for Nonconformist Churches*, "mainly (says the Editor) those of the Book of Common Prayer, but so edited as to remove all traces of sacerdotalism."

It must, however, be borne in mind that considerable portions of our Liturgy were composed and compiled by our Reformers. There is Dean Goulburn's authority for saying that, of the eighty-two Collects, twenty-one were made by the Reformers, and four after the Restoration. The Catechism was not published until 1549. Dr. Blakeney, speaking of the Communion Service of the Church of England, says, "it is essentially different from the Sarum Office of the Mass in its order, construction, accessories, and substance."—(*Hand-Book of the Liturgy*, p. vi.) The Thirty-nine Articles are the work of the Reformers. At the same time, it is a simple matter of history, that by far the larger portion of the Prayer Book is from ancient sources.

The Prayer Book is often called the *Liturgy* (as in its Preface). The word "Liturgy" comes from the Greek λειτουργία, which signified any solemn public ministration or holy service. It is often found in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, where its use is restricted to the service of the Levites in the Tabernacle. Because the earlier forms of prayer were chiefly those used in the administration of the Lord's Supper, some writers have sought to limit the use of the word Liturgy to the Communion Service. So the late J. H. Blunt, in the Annotated Book of Common Prayer, says:—"Inexact writers sometimes designate the whole of the Offices used in Divine Service by the name of 'the Liturgy,' but it is more proper, as well as convenient, to limit the use of the word as above," *i.e.*, to the Office for Holy Communion (p. 344.) Our reply to this shall be in the words of Bingham, a leading authority, who says:—"Though *Liturgy*, in its extended sense, denotes any public office, or ministration as the Apostle uses it (Phil. ii. 30, and 2 Cor. ix. 12) for the ministration of charity; and ecclesiastical writers do the same, often applying it to civil and sacred functions, as to the office of a magistrate or bishop; yet, in a more limited sense it is put to signify those sacred offices which make up the several parts of divine worship, as prayers, reading, preaching, and administration of the sacraments. But it is never used, as the Romanists would appropriate it, for the business of sacrificing only." Bingham supports this

statement by many authorities, including Chrysostom, who, preaching on Romans xv. 16, says that "the Apostle calls preaching λειτουργία and ἱερουγία, *sacrifice* or *sacred service*," and adds, "For this is my priesthood, to preach and publish the Gospel: this is the sacrifice that I offer to God."—(See *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Book xiii., chap. 1, sec. 8.)

The term Liturgy may, then, be properly applied to the whole of the public services of our Church as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

In addition to a vernacular translation of the Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, and the *Te Deum*, the ancient British Church had its Service Book for Public Worship. There are good grounds for believing that this was derived from the Liturgy of the Gallican Church, which may have been received from Ephesus, one of the Seven churches of Asia. We are told that missionaries were sent from Asia Minor to Gaul early in the second century. In the sixth and following centuries the Gallican Liturgy, almost everywhere, gave place to the Roman Ritual.—(See chapter on "Ancient Liturgies" in Humphrey's *Treatise on the Book of Common Prayer*.)

"The ordinary service of the British Church in this early period (writes Procter), most probably consisted of psalms, hymns, and canticles, sung partly at night, partly in the early morning, and again in the evening."

When Augustine arrived in England (A.D. 596) he found the people using their own Liturgy, and sought most anxiously to supplant it by that of Rome. Writing to the Pope, Gregory the Great, for advice on this and other matters, Augustine received the following very judicious answer:—"You know the customs of the Roman Church in which you remember you were bred up. But it pleases me that if you have found anything either in the Roman or in the Gallican, or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the Church of the English, which as yet is new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Choose, therefore, from every Church those

things that are pious, religious, and upright; and when you have, as it were, made them up into one body, let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto."—(*Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, Book i. chap. 27.)

It was frequently sought to force the entire Roman Ritual upon the British Church, and in 747 it was decreed by the council of Cloveshoo that the Romish Missal or Mass Book should be used throughout England.

The various dioceses, however, were by no means unanimous in adopting Roman usages, and the consequence was that the manner of conducting divine service varied. York, Lincoln, Hereford, Bangor, and other places, had each its own form or use, whilst several dioceses united in adopting that known as the "Use of Sarum," which soon became very popular. It was compiled by Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, and put forth A.D. 1085. In common with other service books of the age it contained much that was superstituous and unscriptural.

To the time of the Reformation public prayer was in Latin. The principal service books used were—(1) The *Breviary* or *Portifory*, drawn up under the direction of Pope Gregory VII. in the eleventh century, and containing a service of Prayers, Psalms, Lessons, Readings from the Fathers, and Hymns, arranged for the canonical hours of prayer. It is noteworthy that invocations of the Virgin Mary, and of the Saints, were first introduced into the Breviary A.D. 1278. (2) *The Missal*, for the use of the priest at the celebration of the Mass. (3) *The Manual*, containing the Baptismal, Marriage, Burial, and other occasional services. (4) *The Pontifical*, comprising the Ordination, Confirmation, and other Services which only the Bishop could perform.

During this pre-Reformation period the chief officers of the Church were, in great part, worldly, careless, and immoral. The hearts and consciences of men were ruled by priests not a few of whom were ignorant, idle, impure, and exacting. Church courts were centres of corruption. Church patronage was subject to the grossest abuses. The sacraments were sold, people being taught the necessity of confession and communion, which could not, however, be obtained without money. Public worship was in a

lamentable condition, and practical religion at a very low ebb.

Such was the sad state of matters in our land* at the time the Reformers entered upon the great and difficult task of restoring to the people their civil and religious rights, and giving to them a Bible which they could read in their own tongue, and a Prayer Book which they could understand.

Written copies of *Wyclif's* Bible had, from about 1380, been widely circulated and eagerly read. The introduction of the printing press into England, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, proved a powerful aid to the Reformation movement. In 1525 appeared *Tyndale's* New Testament, printed in English. In 1534 Convocation petitioned the King to authorise an English Version of the *whole* Bible. In 1535 *Coverdale's* translation of the Bible was published under the patronage of Henry VIII. who ordered a copy to be placed in every church "for every man that would to look and read therein." In 1537 appeared *Matthew's* Bible, edited by *John Rogers, the proto-Martyr* of the Marian reign. In 1539 was published the *Great Bible*, so called on account of its size, and sometimes referred to as *Cramner's* Bible, because it contained a preface written by him. This was speedily set up in the churches, with a direction that it be read aloud. In 1542 it was ordered that on "every Sunday and Holy-day throughout the year, the curate† of every parish church, after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat*, should openly read to the people one chapter of the New Testament in English, without exposition, and when the New Testament is read over, then to begin the Old." It was from the "Great Bible" that the Prayer Book Version of the Psalms and portions in the Communion Service were taken. In 1541 a direction was given that every parish which had not provided a Bible, should, before the Feast of

---

* For abundant proof of this the reader is referred to the closing portion of Canon Perry's *Student's History of the English Church. First* period. (Murray).

† *Curate* is here used in the literal sense of one who has the *care*, or *cure* of souls.

All Saints, "buy* and provide Bibles of the largest and greatest volume, and cause the same to be set and fixed in the parish church."

These important facts should be remembered, not only for the sake of their great historical interest, but also because they indicate very clearly the great principles upon which the English Reformation proceeded.

In response to a craving for something which the people could understand, the "Primer," a small manual for private devotion, had been published in English in the fourteenth century. During the reign of Henry VIII., three English primers were put forth. In 1542 it was proposed in Convocation that the Service books and Mass books should be "examined, corrected, and reformed"; and the names of the Popes and Thomas a Becket erased; and that the dressing of images and setting up of lighted candles before such books should be discontinued.

In 1544 the Litany was revised by Cranmer, one alteration being the omission of a long list of invocations of saints.

Henry VIII. died in January, 1547. The services of the Church were still in Latin, save that the Litany and the words at the giving of the bread in Holy Communion were said in English, and the Lessons, Gospels, and Epistles read in English after they had been read in Latin.

Now it was not only most desirable that the public services of the Church should be in English, but it was essential that the Service books themselves should be purged from the dangerous errors and superstitious accretions which had long marred their beauty and impeded their usefulness. These ends were soon to be realised.

On the accession of Edward VI., in 1547, the first Book of Homilies was published, and directed to be read in churches. In 1548, Convocation approved the proposal

---

* The price was fixed at ten shillings "unbound," or twelve shillings "if well and sufficiently bound, trimmed, and clasped." It may be added that prior to the publication of the Authorised Version in 1611 there also appeared in England the *Geneva* Bible, 1557-60, which maintained its popularity for sixty years, and the *Bishop's* Bible 1568-72. The Roman Catholics published in 1582 the *Rheims* Testament, and in 1609 the *Douay* Bible.

that the Lord's Supper (which had hitherto been administered in one kind only) should be given in both kinds, thus restoring the cup to the laity. An English Order of Communion was put forth, the result being that what had been "the Mass" became "the Communion."

The following extract from the injunctions to the clergy issued in 1547, in the name of the King, speaks for itself:—"To the intent that all superstition and hypocrisy crept into divers men's hearts may vanish away, the clergy shall not set forth or extol any images, relics, or miracles, for any superstition or lucre, nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint or image; but reproving the same, they shall teach that all goodness, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for only of God, as of the very author and giver of the same, and no other." Two lights were permitted to remain upon the "high altar," for "the signification that Christ is the very true Light of the World."

Thus the Reformation proceeded apace. In carrying out the various changes, the Reformers had no easy task; for besides the opposition of the Romanists, they had to control the innovating tendencies of some of their own indiscreet friends.

In the year 1549 the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., sanctioned by Convocation, was presented to and accepted by Parliament. An Act of Uniformity was passed ordering it to be used in all churches on and after Whit-Sunday, 1549.* Most of the old Service books were destroyed. About this time permission was given to the clergy to marry.

Several pages would be required to enumerate the differences between the new Prayer Book and the old Service books. Suffice it to say that the rubrics were very considerably reduced in number; invocations of saints, legends, lives of the saints, and all else that was considered superstitious, were excluded; and the whole was in English instead of Latin. The following extract from the preface indicates the principles upon which the new Prayer Book was constructed:—"Here you have an order for prayer (as touching the reading of Holy Scrip-

* The price of the Book was 2/2 if unbound; 3/8 if in boards.

ture) much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious than that which of late was used. It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some be untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious, and is ordained nothing to be read, but the very pure Word of God, the Holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same; and that in such a language and order, as is most easy and plain for the understanding, both of the readers and hearers."

The names of those who compiled and arranged our first English Prayer Book should not be forgotten. They number thirteen, viz.:—Archbishop *Cranmer* (Canterbury); Bishops *Goodrich* (Ely), *Holbech* (Lincoln), *Day* (Chichester), *Skip* (Hereford), *Thirleby* (Westminster), and *Ridley* (Rochester, afterwards London); also *May*, Dean of St. Paul's; *Cox*, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (afterwards Bishop of Ely); *Taylor*, Dean of Lincoln (afterwards Bishop of Lincoln); *Haynes*, Dean of Exeter; *Robertson*, Archdeacon of Leicester; and *Redmayne*, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The new Prayer Book was on the whole very well received. Deliberate attempts were made by some to Romanise * the new Service book and to use with it some of the older forms. It was sought to enforce the proper use of the Prayer Book by a royal visitation, the Articles of which ordered "that no minister do counterfeit the Popish Mass, as to kiss the Lord's Table, washing his fingers at every time of the Communion," etc.—(Cardwell, *Docum. Annals*, i. 63).

Not a long time elapsed before disputes arose about vestments. Several continental Reformers were now in England; two of them, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer, occupied Divinity chairs at Oxford and Cambridge. The result of the various ecclesiastical and theological discussions was that in 1552 the Prayer Book was revised in certain particulars, *e.g.* the Surplice alone was ordered to take the place of the old vestments; the introductory sentences of Scripture, with the Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution were prefixed both to the Morning and Evening services,

* A reference to *ante*, pp. 7-10, shows how history repeats itself.

both of which, hitherto, had commenced with the Lord's Prayer. Unction of the Sick was dropped. But the most important changes were made in the Communion Service; the words "commonly called the Mass" were omitted from the title; the name "Altar" was supplanted by "the Lord's Table"; the minister was directed to stand at the "North side" of the Table; the bread was to be "such as is usual to be eaten"; the rubric ordering water to be mixed with the wine was expunged; the prayer for the dead was omitted, and the "black" rubric inserted, declaring that by kneeling no adoration of the "corporal presence" of Christ was intended.

Notwithstanding that this revised form was little used for a time, owing to the accession of Queen Mary in 1553, its history is of much importance, inasmuch as the Prayer Book thus amended is substantially the same as our present one.

During the unhappy reign of Mary, things were for a time changed. The Prayer Books put forth in Edward's reign were not permitted to be used, and the services of the Church were once more after the Romish fashion.

In 1558 Elizabeth succeeded to the crown, and in 1559 Crammer's Prayer Book of 1552 was, with a few modifications, restored and generally accepted. The Ornaments rubric, the vague wording of which has caused so much strife in recent times, was added. Strype (*Annals*) says that out of the 9,400 clergy not more than 189 refused to comply with the new order of things. In 1560 the book was accepted by the Church of Ireland.

This Prayer Book was used during the long reign of Elizabeth, a period which witnessed the rise of the Puritan party who strongly opposed both Episcopacy and the Prayer Book. The Puritans specially objected to the surplice, the use of the cross in baptism, the playing of organs, the observance of Saints' days, the ring in Marriage, and kneeling at the Lord's Supper. It was to meet their objections that Richard Hooker wrote his famous work entitled "Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity."

In 1603 James I. became King. The Puritans soon brought their supposed grievances under his notice by presenting a petition called, from the number of its signatures, the "Millenary Petition." They asked for a

conference, so that the matters objected to might be discussed. This resulted in the famous Hampton Court Conference, which met in January, 1604, and was presided over by the King. As a consequence, a few trifling changes were made in the Rubrics and Thanksgivings, and the exposition of the Sacraments was added to the Catechism.

The stirring events which took place during the reign of Charles I. and the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, must be hastily passed over. Cromwell's rule was a period of violence and injustice, "during which the voice of the Church of England was silenced, her ministers ejected, and her temples, sepulchres and venerable remains of antiquity defaced or destroyed." "The crown, and the mitre, and the Prayer Book, were alike rolled in the dust." In January, 1645, an Ordinance of Parliament passed by the Puritans took away the Book of Common Prayer, and put in its place a "Directory for the public worship of God throughout the three Kingdoms." The Prayer Book was prohibited both in Churches and private houses. A fine of five pounds was the penalty for the first offence; ten pounds for the second; and a year's imprisonment, without bail, for the third. "It was a crime in a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians."—(Macaulay, *History of England*, vol. i, p. 160).

In 1660 the restoration of the Monarchy gave back to the Church her privileges, and brought joy to the people. In 1661, the Savoy Conference was held, and resulted in a revision of the Prayer Book in 1662. Altogether, nearly 600 changes were made, many of which were of an unimportant nature. A full list will be found in Procter's *History of the Prayer Book*. In all its distinctive features, the book remained the same. The general principles which guided the revisers are expressed in the preface prefixed:—"Our general aim in this undertaking was not to gratify this or that party in any of their unreasonable demands; but to do that, which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church; the procuring of reverence, and exciting of piety and devotion in the public worship of God; and the cutting off occasion

from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church. And as to the several variations from the former Book, whether by alteration, addition, or otherwise, it shall suffice to give this general account, That most of the alterations were made, either first, for the better direction of them that are to officiate in any part of Divine Service; which is chiefly done in the Calendars and Rubrics; or secondly, for the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times, and the clearer explanation of some other words and phrases, that were either of doubtful signification, or otherwise liable to misconstruction; or thirdly, for a more perfect rendering of such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy."

This revision was carefully carried out, and the Revised Book was in 1662 adopted by Convocation, sanctioned by Parliament, and assented to by the King. Certain printed copies were carefully examined and certified under the Great Seal, and are known as the "Sealed Books."

Since 1662 the Prayer Book has remained untouched, save the disuse, in 1859, of the State Services for Nov. 5th, Jan. 30th, and May 29th, and the introduction of the New Table of Lessons in 1871. In 1872 liberty was given to the clergy in certain cases to use a shortened service.

A few words may be said on the difficult matter of Prayer Book revision. This subject has long been a fertile source of discussion. Bishops, and other Church dignitaries, with many leading laymen, have frequently expressed themselves in favour of a few slight alterations, and it cannot be denied that recent cases in the Ecclesiastical Courts furnish abundant proof that such are required. The late Archbishop Sumner's words have often been quoted:—"If I could be allowed to alter twenty words of the Prayer Book I should attach 20,000 Dissenters to the Church of England." Bishop Magee (Peterborough) and Bishop Fraser (Manchester) have each recently spoken in favour of expunging the ambiguous Ornaments' Rubric. Dean Howson writes:—"The giving up of the public recital of the Athanasian Creed at times of worship, and the modifying of some places in the Burial Service, would be a great satisfaction to many devout

people, and would relieve the clergy from those elaborate explanations, which, however satisfactory, are still necessary." —(*Principles at Stake*, p. 377.) Dean Perowne says :— "Deeply do I regret that when the Church so carefully excluded the word "altar" from the Prayer Book, she did not also exclude the word "priest," as being capable of a wrong and unchristian meaning. The force of words is great, the corruption of words carries with it wide consequences."—(*Sermons preached in Peterborough Cathedral*, 1883.) It is well to remember that the principle of revision was admitted by the compilers of the Prayer Book in their Preface. Article XXXIV. declares that "every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

But it must be evident to every thoughtful mind that Prayer Book revision, even in the few slight points indicated, is no easy task in the present disturbed state of party feeling. To quote the opinion of Dean Vaughan :—"The difficulties of revision are apparent. The Church of England has practically lost its machinery for self-modification. To deal exclusively with questions of doctrine, or even of ritual, Convocation has no power, Parliament little fitness."—(*Revision of the Liturgy*.)

This being the case, we confess ourselves in sympathy with the view expressed many years ago by the Rev. John Newton :—"As to our Liturgy, I am far from thinking it incapable of amendment; although when I consider the temper and spirit of the present times, I dare not wish that the improvement of it should be attempted, lest the remedy should be worse than the disease."*

---

* We give, for information, the changes suggested by the Prayer Book Revision Society :—

PRIEST.—The substitution of the word *Minister* or *Presbyter* for *Priest*, whenever the officiating Clergyman is intended.

ORNAMENTS' RUBRIC.—That the Rubric, commonly called the "Ornaments' Rubric," be expunged from the Prayer Book, and some plain directions substituted.

GENERAL RUBRICS.—Such alterations as may avoid undesirable repetitions, and make the Services more edifying and elastic. A revision of the Tables and Calendar.

A few words on the general character of the Prayer Book. It is based upon and permeated with Holy Scripture. Its construction and arrangement is according to the proportion of the Christian faith. God the Father, in the purity of His holiness, the grandeur of His perfections, and the wonders of His grace, is glorified.* God the Son, in His self-sacrificing love, His holy life, His all-atoning sacrifice for sin, His priestly intercession and His risen glory, is exalted. God the Holy Ghost, in His work and offices as the Lord and Giver of Life, is recognised and honoured in every service. The nature and sinfulness of man; his weaknesses, his need of a Saviour, the necessity of a new birth, and other great facts in relation to the great plan of salvation, are fully and clearly dwelt upon. The divine origin and priceless value of the Scriptures, the privileges and blessings of public worship, the necessity of constant prayer, the nature and purpose of the divinely ordained ministry and sacraments, are all clearly indicated in simple and scriptural language.

ATHANASIAN CREED.—That the public recitation of the Athanasian Creed be no longer imperative.

COMMUNION SERVICE.—Removal of a *few* phrases which have been alleged to favour Priestly Confession and Absolution, and other unscriptural doctrines and errors.

BAPTISMAL OFFICES.—Removal of expressions which seem to assert Spiritual Regeneration as *inseparably* connected with Baptism. A review of the Sponsorial System. The *Church Catechism* and *Confirmation* Service to be in harmony.

ORDINAL AND VISITATION.—The authoritative form of words accompanying the imposition of hands [*Receive, etc.*] to be rendered, as in primitive times, and through long ages, in the language of *Prayer*. The clause, "Whose sins Thou dost forgive, etc.," in the Ordinal and the corresponding Absolution "*I absolve thee*" in the Visitation of the Sick, to be omitted.

MARRIAGE SERVICE.—The alteration or omission of some passages at present unsuited for public reading.

BURIAL OF THE DEAD.—Modification of *Rubric* respecting those *who die unbaptized*, and expressions which seem to imply the salvation of *every one* over whom the service is performed.

COMMINATION SERVICE.—Omission of the *Curses* and accompanying *Exhortations*.

* Some thoughts in this and the next paragraph are from an admirable sermon entitled "The Book of Prayer for the House of Prayer," by Bishop Stevens, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The honour paid to our Lord Jesus Christ, as the grand centre of all Christian worship, the Alpha and Omega of all Christian doctrine, is most noteworthy in the arrangement of the Prayer Book. *Advent*, which marks the beginning of the Church's year, points us back to the first coming of Christ in humiliation, and bids us prepare for His second coming in glory. *Christmas* tells us that Christ took upon Him our nature, and dwelt among men. The *Epiphany* teaches us that Christ's work was not for the Jews only, but that He was also a Light to lighten the Gentiles. In the solemn season of *Lent*, we are bidden to contemplate our Lord amid the darkness of sorrow, as He is about to be betrayed, and given into the hands of wicked men. On *Good Friday*, we survey the wondrous Cross, and glory in the truth that there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, He made "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." At *Easter*, we rejoice in the glad fact—the keystone of Christianity—that "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that sleep." On *Ascensiontide*, as we gaze by faith upon Christ "exalted with great triumph unto His kingdom in heaven," we pray that we "may also in heart and mind thither ascend, and with Him continually dwell."

The Litany, the Creeds, the Collects, the Communion Service, and the Articles have all a history full of interest.

The Litany—a service of *Supplication*—is a very ancient form of prayer. It was originally used as a special penitential service in times of calamity. In 1544, the English Litany (which the people had been able to read in their own tongue for more than 150 years) was carefully revised by Cranmer, and put forth in a form almost identical with what it is now.

The Three Creeds are for instruction in doctrine, and each contains an epitome of the faith of Christendom. "The Creed which unites us with all the past, preserves for us the complete and harmonious outline of the foundations of faith."—(*Dr. Westcott.*) The *Apostles' Creed* (the great Creed of the Western or Roman Church) is found in the daily services, and in the Catechism, and presents a summary of the teaching of the Apostles. It probably

assumed its present shape about the close of the fifth century. The *Nicene Creed* (the great Creed of the Eastern or Greek Church) has a place in the Communion Service. It was first drawn up at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, as a protest against the heresies of Arius and others who denied the divinity of Christ. Some additions were made at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. The *Creed of St. Athanasius* was probably framed in Spain or Gaul, in the sixth century. Some give it a later date. It is named after a great bishop of Alexandria, who spent his life in defending the doctrines enlarged upon; but its authorship is uncertain. This Creed has been used in the Greek Church since A.D. 800; and was adopted by the Roman Church, A.D. 930. Our Church declares that "the Three Creeds, *Nicene* Creed, *Athanasius's* Creed, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles'* Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture."—(*Art.* VIII.)

THE COLLECTS are a store-house of devotion. Their language is in the best and purest English known, and is thoroughly scriptural. Many of them are from the most ancient sources; others (as those for the first three Sundays in Advent) were framed by the Reformers. "It is a delight to us (says Dean Goulburn*) to know and believe that in the results of the Reformers' work (forty-eight old Collects translated, nine altered, and twenty-nine new made) we have not only Scriptural truth, but that truth as tinged and dyed in the experience of very learned and devout men, all of whom suffered, whilst many died for the championship of it. It was out of their own treasury that they brought forth things new and old; that is, out of the store-house of hearts disciplined into the knowledge of the truth by God's Word and Spirit and Providence."

Concerning the COMMUNION SERVICE, drawn up by Cranmer and others in 1549, and revised in 1552, as already mentioned, we need only add that its language is in complete accord with Scripture, and is distinctly opposed to certain present-day teachings in favour of a "sacrificing"

* The Dean's *Exposition of the Collects* is a treasury of historical and devotional reading.

priesthood, and the offering up in the sacrament of a "propitiatory sacrifice."

The THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES form an authoritative standard of Church of England doctrine. The first Articles, setting forth certain distinctive doctrines, were put forth in 1536, and are known as "The Ten Articles." In 1539, the "Thirteen Articles" were drawn up. In the same year the "Six Articles" (which favoured Romish teaching) were published. In 1552, a series of Forty-two Articles "was agreed upon by bishops and other learned men in the Synod of London, for avoiding of controversy and establishment of godly concord on certain matters of religion." Cranmer had the chief hand in framing these. When Elizabeth became queen, the Forty-two Articles were revised under the direction of Archbishop Parker, and, having been reduced to Thirty-nine, were approved by Convocation in 1562. For more than three hundred years they have been the chief standard of the doctrines and principles of the Church of England.*

The CATECHISM contains the elements or first principles of Christian doctrine. The former part was published in 1549, and included in the Confirmation Service. The Exposition of the Sacraments was added in 1604, and is supposed to have been compiled by Bishop Overall from Nowell's Catechism of 1561. The late Bishop Jacobson says:—"The first part of this smaller Catechism (*i.e.* Nowell's) agrees exactly with that given in the two Liturgies of King Edward VI.; and the additions made by Bishop Overall, after the Hampton Court Conference, were evidently abridged from it."—(*Preface, Nowell's Catechism.*) It has been justly remarked that the Catechism contains the *Credenda*, the *Oranda*, and the *Agenda* of the Christian faith—what we should believe, pray for, and do.

In estimating the character of the Prayer Book, it is just to bear in mind the high standard taken by its compilers. It is sometimes said by those not conversant with its history, that the Prayer Book was framed on the basis of a compromise: this statement is at once rebutted by the preface

* For opinions of eminent Churchmen on the Articles, see *ante* pp. 40, 41.

to the Book. The Prayer Book is constructed on the principle that those who take part in its services are what they profess to be. Those who bring their children to Holy Baptism are supposed to be *believers*. The Communion Service is for the *Lord's people*. The Burial Service is intended for those "who die in the Lord." It is on this hypothetical principle (as G. S. Faber clearly shows) that St. Paul's Epistles were composed. On this point the late Professor Mozley says :—"When we examine the principles upon which Church Services and Catechisms are constructed, we find that they admit of a class of statements which are literal in form, but hypothetical in meaning."—(*Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, p. 365.) In an earthly Church where, in the very nature of things, the evil is mingled with the good, the rule by which the compilers of the Prayer Book were guided was the only feasible one.

Seeing, then, that we have this legacy from our departed forefathers—confessors and martyrs of the Church—let us study its history, and enter into its devotional spirit. We look upon it, and rightly so, as "the offspring of the thoughtful, prayerful efforts of men, whose character was as holy as their ecclesiastical position was lofty—whose spiritual acquirements in the knowledge of God's Word and man's need were as great as their knowledge of the liturgical heritage of the Church from the Apostolic age to their own." Let us never regard the Prayer Book as a perfect book, or venture to put it on a level with the Word of God. Compiled by fallible men, "it is not the greater light to rule the day, but the lesser light to shine upon our night of ignorance and infirmity, and to guide our feet along the pathway of Prayer and Praise." May knowledge be given us to value it rightly, and grace vouchsafed to use it profitably !

"We love the place, O Lord,
Wherein Thine honour dwells :
The joy of Thine abode,
All other joy excels.
We love the House of Prayer,
Wherein Thy servants meet ;
For Thou, O Lord, art there,
Thy chosen ones to greet."

Church Work and Progress.

"Work, for I am with you, saith the Lord."

THE Church of England is essentially a *working* Church. Spiritual results cannot be tabulated, but the figures set forth in the *Official Year Book of the Church*, and in Reports of Church Societies, indicate to some extent the magnitude of the work in which the Church is engaged, and the manifold success and blessing which have accompanied that work, both at home and abroad. The National Church is not merely the Church of the rich, as some of her opponents affirm, but is pre-eminently the Church of the poor. With her vast network of parishes, each with its clergy, church, schools, and parochial organisations, she is the Church of *all* classes. All sorts and conditions of men are invited to participate in her blessings and privileges.

The following details of Church organisation and Church work have been carefully compiled from the *Official Year Book of the Church of England*, the Reports of the Committee of Council on Education, the annual Reports of the Societies named, and other trustworthy authorities:—

CLERGY.—In addition to the bishops, deans, and other dignitaries of the Church, the clergy in England and Wales number about 24,000. Of these some have retired from active work by reason of age, etc., whilst a large number are engaged in the work of education. The number of parochial working clergy in England and Wales now exceeds 20,000.

The following statistics are from the *York Diocesan Calendar* for 1891 :—

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Dioceses	34	Rural Deaneries	*c.* 800
Archbishops	2	Beneficed Clergy	*c.* 14,000
Bishops (including 12 Suffragan, 1 Coadjutor, and 5 Assisting Bishops)	50	Curates and Unbeneficed Clergy	*c.* 7,000
Deans	28	Population (1891)	29,001,018
Archdeacons	87	Area in square miles	58,674
		Church Sittings	*c.* 6,465,000

IRELAND.

Dioceses	13	Archdeacons	34
Archbishops	2	Benefices	1,248
Bishops	11	Curates	343
Deans	32		

Besides these are 7 bishops and 286 clergy in Scotland, 95 bishops in the British Colonies and at missionary stations, and nearly 4,000 clergy.

In 1891, was published a *Return of the Property and Revenues of the Church of England*, presented to Parliament by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, from which it appears that there are now in England and Wales 13,979 parochial cures, as against 10,718 in 1832. The parsonage houses number 11,667.

The annual income of the 13,979 beneficed clergy is about five millions. In January, 1885, the *Guardian* published a table, compiled by the Rev. G. W. Danks from the *Clergy List*, showing that of the benefices 4,332 did not exceed £200 per annum in value; 3,994 were under £300; 2,179 under £400; 1,381 under £500; 1,241 under £700, leaving less than 900 at £1,000 and upwards.

There are about 7,000 curates, with an average stipend of about £135 each.

CHURCHES.—In 1882 the number of permanent churches in England and Wales, licensed for the solemnisation of marriages was 14,573.—(*Vide* Parliamentary Return, 1883.)

To these must be added some thousands of chapels of ease, mission churches, and mission rooms, set apart for public worship.

During the ten years, 1880-89, 772 new churches were built and consecrated, and 2,403 churches restored or enlarged.—*Official Year Book of the Church*, 1891.

During the fifty years ending 1890, nearly 5,000 churches have been built in England and Wales. Lord Hampton's Parliamentary Return (1875) upon Church Building for the thirty-four years, 1840-74, shows that during that period £25,548,703 was raised for the building and restoration of cathedrals and churches. The return is by no means complete, inasmuch as it omits all sums under £500. The *Church Year Book* for 1891 gives £6,409,958 as the sum expended upon church building, restoration, endowment, parsonage houses, and burial grounds, during the five years 1884-88.

Since 1877 six new dioceses have been formed in England —St. Albans, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield—at an estimated cost of half-a-million for the endowment, etc., of the bishoprics. The new diocese of Birmingham is likely soon to be formed. About 500 new churches have been erected in London within the fifty years ending 1890. In the diocese of Manchester 249 new churches were built in the thirty-seven years ending 1884. In the district now forming the see of Liverpool 122 new churches were built during the fifty years ending with 1887. In the diocese of York 104 new churches were consecrated during the episcopate of Dr. Thomson, 1863-90. In Leeds during the twenty-six years, 1860-86, 20 new churches were built and 3 rebuilt. In Birmingham during the twenty-five years, 1860-85, 23 new churches were built, and during the same period 16 new parochial churches were built in Sheffield and 12 in Hull. These are given as typical examples of Church extension.

Church Extension in large Towns.—The following are examples of what has been done in large towns by voluntary contributions for Church and School Extension and Parsonage Houses during the twenty-five years 1860-85. Full details will be found in the *Official Year Book of the Church of England*:—

	£		£
Bristol (including Cathedral Restoration)	505,351	Leeds	358,278
Birmingham	304,557	Leicester	252,790
Bolton	290,000	Manchester	859,757
Halifax	275,117	Nottingham	233,466
Hull	207,335	Sheffield	303,957
		Preston	156,300

During the ten years, 1880-1889, 772 new churches were built or rebuilt and consecrated in England and Wales, and 2,403 churches restored or enlarged.

The *Church Year Book* for 1891 states that the voluntary contributions of the Church for Church Extension, Home and Foreign Missions, Elementary Education, Charitable, and other work during the twenty-five years, 1860-84, EXCEEDED 81½ MILLIONS! The *Year Book* for 1889 explains how this amount is made up.

ORDINATIONS.—During the ten years ending December, 1890, the average number of deacons ordained in England and Wales was about 750 per annum.

CONFIRMATIONS.—The number of persons confirmed in the dioceses of England and Wales during 1890 was 196,964, of whom 78,699 were males and 118,265 females.

HOME AND FOREIGN MISSIONS, EDUCATION, ETC.—Missionary enterprise is one of the best tests of the spiritual life of a Church. The Church of England has many societies for supporting and extending mission work both at home and abroad. Space will only allow a few of the larger societies to be named.

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS (incorporated 1701).—In 1891 this Society had on its list of ordained missionaries 640 clergymen, of whom 156 were native ministers in Asia and Africa. Income for year ending March, 1891, £164,382.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY (founded 1799).—In 1891 this Society had 327 mission stations, 304 ordained European missionaries, 293 native ministers, 56 lay catechists, 75 lady missionaries, and 1,845 schools. Income for year ending March, 1891, £247,737.

COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY (formed 1851) in 1891 made grants in aid of 261 clergymen, catechists, and teachers in the Colonies, and 50 permanent chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe, besides arranging 117 summer chaplaincies supported by contributions of visitors. Income for year ending March, 1891 (including monies raised abroad), £39,201.

THE CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY (instituted 1836),

for assisting the home mission work of the Church by making grants for the stipends of curates and lay agents in poor and populous districts, had in March, 1891, no less than 750 grants on its books, of which 609 were for clergy, 137 for lay agents, and four for women workers. Income for year ending March, 1891, £56,314; additional amount locally raised to meet grants, £32,000. The Society has altogether made grants to the amount of 2¼ millions.

Additional Curates' Society (established 1837), to provide curates for populous parishes, voted, in 1890, grants amounting to £85,475 towards the stipends of curates working in 915 parishes. Total income, 1890, £82,175; additional amount raised locally to meet grants, about £30,000.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (founded 1698) circulates yearly about 600,000 Bibles and Prayer Books in nearly eighty languages; publishes a large variety of tracts and books on religion and the Church; trains elementary school teachers; makes grants towards schools, mission churches, and parochial rooms both at home and in the Colonies, and in aid of missions and Church work generally. Subscriptions and benefactions for year ending March, 1891, £30,791. Grants during the same period in money and books (including Bibles and Prayer Books sold under cost price), £35,702.

The Incorporated Church Building Society (founded 1818) has done a great work in promoting Church extension in England and Wales. Since its formation to 1891 it has raised and expended (excluding cancelled grants) £843,000. No fewer than 7,800 grants have been made, *viz.*, 2,090 to aid the erection of new churches, and 5,710 for the enlargement and improvement of existing churches, besides which grants have been made from a special Mission Buildings Fund towards the erection of 639 mission churches and rooms.

The Bishop of London's Fund (founded by Archbishop Tait, 1863) had, to the beginning of 1891, raised £846,169 for Church extension and spiritual work in the diocese of London. Besides the grants made every year for a large number of missionary clergy, Scripture readers, and Bible women, it had up to 1891 made grants in aid of 164 permanent

churches, of which 152 were built as new parochial churches.

Space will not allow even the names of the many diocesan and other societies formed for Church Extension, Home and Foreign Missions, Educational purposes, and Church work generally. Details of these and outlines of their work will be found in the *Official Year Book of the Church of England.*

It is important to remember that the grants made by Church Building, and Church Extension Societies, the National Society, and Societies like the Church Pastoral Aid and Additional Curates Societies, call for the raising of vast sums locally to meet grants made by such Societies.

Elementary Education.—For many years prior to the Education Act of 1870, the Church of England had educated about 80 per cent. of those who were educated. Mr. Henry Craik, writing on Education (1884) in the "English Citizen Series," says that as recently as 1859 "nine or ten in every eleven schools were established and supported by the Church of England." For more than eighty years the *National Society* has been one of the great moving powers in the Educational work of the Church. Founded in 1811, it declared its main object to be the instruction of the young "in suitable learning, works of industry, and the principles of the Christian religion according to the Established Church." Its eightieth annual Report shows that from its formation to 1891, English Churchmen have raised by voluntary contributions and expended upon Church Schools and training colleges the enormous sum of £34,500,000. This does not include the value of sites.

In the beginning of 1891, there were 11,922 Church schools in England and Wales, as against 6,382 in 1870, when the Elementary Education Act was passed. The following figures from the Returns of the Education Department show the progress of the educational work of the Church during the period of twenty-one years. It must be borne in mind that these figures relate only to schools in receipt of annual Government grants, and that apart from these Churchmen have expended very large sums in the

establishment and maintenance of middle class and other schools :—

Day Schools.	Year ending Aug. 31, 1870. Accommodation.	Year ending Aug. 31, 1890. Accommodation.	Voluntary Subscriptions, 1890.
			£ s. d.
Church of England Schools.....	1,365,080	2,651,078	589,640 14 1
British, Wesleyan, etc., Schools	411,948	631,072	79,723 5 9
Roman Catholic Schools	101,556	341,953	17,253 1 5
School Board Schools	...	1,915,182	70,911 10 9
	1,878,584	5,539,285	757,528 12 0

These figures show that the accommodation in Church Schools has risen from 1,365,080 in 1870 to 2,651,078 in 1890. The number on the registers in 1890 was 2,168,229. The Church was then educating nearly 300,000 more children than were being educated in Board Schools, and its members voluntarily contributed during that year £589,640 towards the support of their schools. During 1890, School Boards levied more than £1,300,000 in the shape of school rates for the education of less than two-thirds of the number of children that were being educated in the Denominational Schools. The average contributions of Churchmen for the building and maintenance of Church Elementary Day Schools have for many years exceeded £580,000 per annum.

The Government returns show that the Church contributed for Education during the past twenty-one years £12,661,298, as against contributions of £3,202,201 from all the other religious bodies combined during this same period.

The Church and Sunday Schools.—No parish organisation can be regarded as complete without a well ordered Sunday School. Since Sunday Schools arose in 1781, chiefly through the combined efforts of Robert Raikes and the Rev. Thos. Stock of Gloucester, they have become a mighty power. The Report of a Royal Commission on Elementary Education, published in 1888, states that the total number of Sunday scholars in England and

Wales is 5,200,000 of all denominations, but this includes over a million of infants under seven and a large number of adults. The "Minority Report" of this Commission, published in the *Guardian* of August 22nd, 1888, gave the number of Sunday scholars of all ages in Church Schools as 2,222,890, and Church Sunday School teachers as 195,222. These figures agree with statistics published in 1884 by Mr. F. J. Hartley, of the Sunday School Union (Nonconformist), and have doubtless since much increased. The *Church of England Sunday School Institute* was established in 1843 for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of Church Sunday Schools, by publishing manuals on Sunday School management and teaching, giving training lessons, and arranging examinations of teachers, etc.

Thus the Church of England, in various ways and by manifold agencies, is seeking to fulfil her great mission both at home and abroad. At home the parochial system is a tower of strength to the Church, and an inestimable blessing to the people. Amid any deterioration which may happen to the neighbourhood, the church buildings, organisations, and clergy remain *permanent* for the social, moral, and spiritual welfare of the inhabitants for the time being. Notwithstanding seasons of trial and difficulty, the Church, conscious of her integrity, faithful to duty, and speaking the truth in love, shall go on increasing in power; and, amid labour and warfare, evil report and good report, shall not be ashamed to meet her enemies in the gate with the words of the patriarch—"When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me; because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him: the blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy."

"Almighty and everlasting God, by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified: Receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before Thee for all estates of men in Thy holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve Thee; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*"

Roman Catholicism and Nonconformity.

"That they all may be one."

THE unhappy divisions of Christendom are sad realities, and constitute powerful barriers to the progress of true religion, of which unity is the aim and strength. But they are not surprising when the frailty and self-will of human nature are considered. If "divisions," "sects," and "heresies" arose in the Apostolic age, it is little wonder they should abound now.

Still, notwithstanding that the Church of Christ has been so often

> "By schisms rent asunder,
> By heresies distrest,"

she has gone on from strength to strength. "The Lord knoweth them that are His." Her loyal members, trusting in their Divine Leader, and treading the path of duty, may possess their souls in patience, pondering the suggestive words of St. Paul—"There must be also heresies (*margin*, "sects") among you that they which are approved may be made manifest" (1 Cor. xi. 19).

In *Whitaker's Almanack* for 1891 are the names of more than two hundred religious sects and denominations in England and Wales, whose places of worship had been certified to the Registrar-General. This list is, however, somewhat misleading, as in it some belonging to the same denomination are variously described; whilst others are

branches of foreign religious communities, and others (as Young Men's Christian Associations) are not separate religious bodies.

The following list, compiled by a correspondent of the *Record*, appeared in July, 1891. From it are excluded (1) all bodies of persons who assemble together, but not for religious purposes; (2) all who meet for religious purposes simply as congregations, without any idea of forming a separate denomination. The classification is from an historical standpoint :—

I. Episcopalians.

1. Church of England.

2. Reformed or Free Episcopal Church.
3. Catholic and Apostolic Church.

II. Presbyterians.

1. Established Presbyterian Church.
2. Presbyterian Free Church.
3. Reformed Presbyterians.
4. United Presbyterians.
5. Glassites or Sandemanians.

III. Independents or Congregationalists.

IV. Baptists.

1. General Baptists.
2. Particular or Calvinistic Baptists.
3. Open Communion Baptists.
4. Strict Baptists.
5. Congregational Baptists.
6. Presbyterian Baptists.
7. Unitarian Baptists.
8. Bunyan Baptists.
9. Seventh-day Baptists.

V. Friends, or Quakers.

VI. Unitarians, or Socinians.

1. Presbyterian Unitarians.
2. Congregational Unitarians.
3. Baptist Unitarians.

VII. Methodists.

1. Wesleyan Methodists.
2. Calvinistic Methodists.
3. Arminian Methodists.
4. Inghamites.
5. Lady Huntingdon's Connexion.
6. Primitive Methodists.
7. Bible Christians.
8. Methodist New Connexion.
9. Methodist Free Church.
10. Methodist Reformed Church.
11. Refuge Methodists.
12. Modern Methodists.
13. Benevolent Methodists.
14. Independent Methodists.

VIII. Brethren.—[Divided, *e.g.*, Close Brethren, Open Brethren.]

IX. Evangelistic Bands of Workers, *e.g.*, the Hallelujah Band, the Glory Band, &c., &c., who usually describe themselves as Unsectarian.

X. Free Churches, *e.g.*, those who describe themselves as Free Christians, Believers in Christ, Followers of the Lord Jesus, &c. They are generally Calvinistic in doctrine, and Congregational in discipline.

XI. Christian Communities not coming under the above heads.

1. Advent Church.
2. Southcotters.
3. Christadelphians.
4. Eliasites.
5. Dependents.
6. Peculiar People.
7. Salvation Army.
8. Separatists.
9. Universalists.
10. Christian Israelites.
11. New and Latter House of Israel.

XII. Branches of Foreign Religious Communities.

1. Lutherans.
2. German Reformed Church.
3. French Reformed Church.
4. Dutch Reformed Church.
5. Roman Catholics.
6. Greek Church.
7. Russo-Greek Church.
8. Moravians, or United Brethren.
9. Swedenborgians.
10. Latter-day Saints, or Mormons.

XIII. Non-Christian Communities.

1. Positivists.
2. Humanitarians.
3. Theists.
4. Spiritualists.
5. Eclectics.
6. Jews.
7. Mohammedans or Moslems.
8. [Theosophists.]

Looking at this list, and allowing that some of the divisions had their rise in conscientious convictions, whilst others were caused by the intolerance of a dominant party, it must be admitted that many sprang from comparatively trivial causes, and are mainly the outcome of party spirit and self-will.

It has been well observed that the great Nonconformist bodies often bear witness to some special truth really to be found in the Church of England, but which for a time had been somewhat obscured.

Short notices of the leading Nonconformist organisations may be helpful. First, however, we would name a body already referred to, and who are really separatists.

The Roman Catholics.—These acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, and follow the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome. They hold that St. Peter was prince of the Apostles, and the first bishop of Rome; and that he was empowered to hand on his special commission to his successors. They affirm that outside their Church there is no salvation. At the Reformation the

English Church threw off the yoke of Rome, and declared that "the Pope hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England."

The first English Roman Catholics arose in 1570, when the Pope issued a Bull of Excommunication against Queen Elizabeth. A small party, preferring the supremacy of the Pope to that of England's lawful sovereign, separated from the National Church, and became the first English Roman Catholics. "The English Church is not a schism from the Church of Rome, but the English Roman Catholics seceded from the old Church of England" (Lane).

From the time of Elizabeth the Church of Rome has made continuous efforts to regain supremacy in England; and never were these efforts more determined than at present, as their organ, the *Tablet* (May, 1859), says—"What we of course aim at is to be, as we have once been, the *dominant Church of England*."

For many years English Roman Catholics were subject to certain penalties and disabilities, but these in 1829 were annulled by the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, which in civil matters practically placed Roman Catholics on a footing with Nonconformists.

In 1850, under the influence of Cardinal Wiseman, Pope Pius IX. divided England into thirteen dioceses, bearing English titles, the Cardinal being appointed archbishop of Westminister. He was succeeded in 1865 by Henry Edward Manning, a convert from the Church of England.

In May, 1890, the Roman Catholic *Tablet* speaks thus of the advances made by the Papacy since the re-establishment of its jurisdiction in England, which it calls a "reconquering advance":—"Had anyone then predicted that London within fifty years would be studded with stately temples of Catholic worship, on the scale of and with the architectural pretensions of cathedrals, he would have been scoffed at as a fanatic or a madman. Yet the number of churches, chapels, and stations, which amounted in 1840 to 457 for England and Wales, and sixty-five for Scotland, or a total for Great Britain of 522 has since been multiplied threefold, the aggregated figure for 1890 being 1,641, composed of 1,312 for England and Wales, and 329 for Scotland. The number of priests has grown in a like proportion from a

total of 624 to one of 2,791, that for Scotland from 73 to 329, and of England and Wales from 551 to 2,444. Still more rapid has been the multiplication of the religious orders, for while at the beginning of our term there were but one convent north, and nineteen south of the Tweed, England has now 195 for men, and 400 for women, and Scotland 13 for the former, and 34 for the latter, giving Great Britain a total of 642 for both sexes together. The London district contained in 1840 but 4 convents and 105 priests, and Middlesex and Surrey had but 20 and 7 chapels respectively. The archdiocese of Westminster has now 353 priests, 124 churches, chapels, and stations, and 111 convents (including branches) of both sexes."

In considering the causes for this rapid advance, the *Tablet* gives the first place to the Oxford and Ritualistic movements, saying, "Until the sea gives up the dead that are in it, no rendering shall be quite so marvellous as that made by Protestantism to Catholicism during the last fifty years. From the Dead Sea of Anglicanism have arisen in that period multitudes to be the passengers and the mariners of ST. PETER'S bark."

Although the number of English converts to Roman Catholicism may not be in proportion to the increase of priests, chapels, and monastic buildings, yet it must be allowed that the Ritualistic movement has greatly strengthened the ranks of Romanism.

We append the Roman Confession of Faith, commonly called the Creed of Pope Pius IV. (A.D. 1564), to which all admitted into the Church of Rome must give their public assent. After reciting the Nicene Creed it proceeds:

I.—"I most firmly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

II.—"I do admit the Holy Scriptures in the same sense that Holy Mother Church hath held and doth hold; whose business it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them. Nor will I ever receive or interpret them except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

III.—"I profess also that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the New Law instituted by Jesus

Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all necessary for all; *viz.*, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; and that they confer grace—and that of these Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be repeated. I receive, moreover, and admit all the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church in the solemn administration of all these Sacraments."

IV.—"All and everything which the Holy Council of Trent hath defined and declared in the matter of Original Sin and Justification, I embrace and receive.

V.—"I profess likewise that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation.

VI.—"I confess that under either kind alone, a whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament, is received.

VII.—"I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are assisted by the suffrages of the Faithful.

VIII.—"In like manner I hold, that the Saints reigning with God are to be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.*

---

* The exhibition at Treves of the "Holy Coat," which purports to be the "seamless garment" of Christ for which the Roman soldiers cast lots, is an example of this veneration of relics. In the summer of 1891, after having been hidden for forty-seven years, it was again publicly exhibited, and attracted vast crowds of pilgrims. The Pope, in a letter giving permission, commends the Bishop of Treves for repeating "an old traditional ceremony so dear to believers by publicly exhibiting, as his predecessors were wont to do, the seamless garment of our Lord Jesus Christ, of which the Cathedral of Treves boasts as its dearest treasure." Argenteuil, near Paris, has also a "holy coat," but the Congregation of Rites at Rome has settled the difficulty of rival claims, by deciding that the two coats belong to different periods of our Lord's life.

IX.—"I most firmly assert that the Images of Christ, of the Ever-Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be rendered to them.

X.—"And I most firmly assert that the power of Indulgences has been left to the Church by Christ, and that their use by Christian people is of the most saving [or wholesome] character.

XI.—"I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church to be the mother and mistress of all Churches.

XII.—"I vow and swear a true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.*

XIII.—"All other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and Eucumenical Councils, and specially by the Holy Council of Trent, I undoubtingly receive and profess, and at the same time everything contrary thereto, and every kind of heresy condemned, rejected, and anathematised by the Church, I in like manner condemn, reject, and anathematise."

During recent years two unscriptural articles of faith have been imposed by the Church of Rome upon her members, *viz.*, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (1854) and the Infallibility of the Pope (1870).

Amongst Nonconformist bodies may be named:—

The Presbyterians, now mainly confined to Scotland, hold evangelical doctrines as set forth in the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (A.D. 1649), and the Longer and Shorter Catechisms (A.D. 1648). These are authoritative standards of doctrine, discipline, and government. In matters of government, episcopacy and congregationalism are alike disclaimed, the rule being intrusted to pastors and elders,

* Mr. Gladstone, speaking of the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century, says that she "has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; that no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and that she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."—See *Vaticanism* and *The Vatican Decrees.*

who constitute what is called "Kirk Session." A number of sessions in a specified district compose a "Presbytery," which has the power of ordaining ministers and dealing with congregations generally. Several presbyteries constitute a "Provincial Synod," the General Assembly being the highest Court.

Presbyterianism was introduced into Scotland about 1560, under the influence of John Knox, and a little later on developed in England under Cartwright, who in 1572 formed the first English Presbyterian congregation. It has declined in England, and in Scotland experienced divisions which render its history somewhat complex. The two leading bodies are:—(1) The *Church of Scotland*, which is the National Established Church; (2) the *Free Church of Scotland*, a large and influential body which seceded from the National Church, and formed a separate organisation in 1843. Besides these are the *United Presbyterian Church;* the *United Original Seceders;* the *Evangelical Union of Morrisonians;* and the *United Presbyterian Church of England.*

Independents, or Congregationalists.—These maintain that every local organised body of Christians is a Church complete in itself, and independent of the control of any superior ecclesiastical authority. The older Independents held in substance the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, but the doctrines now generally held are much broader. Episcopacy and the union of Church and State are opposed, and each congregation selects its own pastor. The principles of this body were first clearly propounded and developed about 1568, in the reign of Elizabeth, by one Robert Browne, chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk, whence the name "Brownists" given to the early Independents. In 1662, the Act of Uniformity (regarded by some as cruel and impolitic) excluded from the ministerial office in the Church of England all who refused to conform to it and subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles. Those who objected were called Nonconformists.

In 1833 the Congregational Union was formed "to deliberate, not to legislate; to advise, not to compel." This Union publishes in its Year Book a Declaration of Faith, Church Order, and Discipline.

THE BAPTISTS.—These in matters of Church government and the ministry differ little from Congregationalists. Their distinctive feature is the rejection of infant baptism. They regard *immersion* as essential to and the only proper mode of baptism, rendering—Mark xvi. 16—"He that believeth, and is *immersed*, shall be saved."

The first Baptist congregation in England was formed in Wapping, London, 1633, having seceded from an Independent congregation in Blackfriars. The Baptists are divided into various bodies, the two leading ones being—(1) The *Particular* (or Calvinistic) *Baptists*, who hold, with the early Baptists, the tenet of Particular redemption; (2) the *General Baptists*, who maintain that Christ died for all. In 1891 these two sections became united.

THE UNITARIANS (or *Socinians*).—These refuse to accept the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, ascribing divinity to God the Father only, thus denying the doctrine of the Trinity. They hold that Christ is a mere man, that His office was prophetical, and not priestly. They deny the imputation of Adam's guilt, reject the atonement, and affirm that no propitiation of divine justice was necessary or possible by means of *vicarious* suffering. The inspiration of Scripture and the eternity of future punishment are also denied. It will be seen that Unitarianism is directly opposed to the teaching of the Church of England. Its mode of government is congregational. Unitarian views were held in England in the middle of the sixteenth century, but one of the first regular Unitarian congregations was that established in Essex Street, London, in 1774. Many Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist congregations have lapsed into Unitarianism.

THE FRIENDS (or *Quakers*).—A Society founded by George Fox about 1648. Their "Declaration of Christian Doctrine" affirms the main facts of evangelical truth, but the Friends are by no means uniform in their theological views. The doctrine most emphasised is that of the *Inner Light*, "the Light of Christ in man." They have no ordained or paid ministry, and object to *set* forms of service. They do not practice the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, holding that these are entirely spiritual

ordinances without symbol or outward sign. They refuse to take oaths, and protest against war in every form. The Friends played a prominent part in the abolition of slavery.

The Wesleyan Methodist Societies, of which there are several, agree in doctrine, but differ on certain points of Church government and discipline. Each body regards John Wesley as its founder, and has its annual Conference, when ministers are ordained and appointed, and general business transacted. Local congregations are grouped into circuits, and *these* into districts. The original Society is now designated "The Wesleyan Methodist Church." The "Model Trust Deed" of the *Wesleyan Methodists*, dated July 3rd, 1832, after reciting the origin of the Methodist Societies in 1738, and the first Conference in 1744, directs that only such persons should be allowed to speak and expound in their chapels as should be duly appointed by Conference or by the Superintendent preacher, and that "no person shall be permitted to preach or expound in the said chapel who shall teach any doctrine contrary to what is contained in certain *Notes to the New Testament* by the late John Wesley, and the first four volumes of sermons reputed to be written by him."

John Wesley was a duly ordained clergyman of the Church of England. It is clear from his own words that his purpose in forming what he called a "Methodist *Society*" was not secession from the Church, but simply that of *a revival of religion within it.* The following words were written by him shortly before his death, and appear in the Arminian Magazine for April, 1790: "I never had any design of separating from the Church: I have no such designs now . . . . nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many will separate from it, and will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party. . . . In flat opposition to these *I declare that I live and die* A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND NONE WHO REGARD MY OPINION OR ADVICE WILL EVER SEPARATE FROM IT."

Whilst John Wesley lived he regarded the Methodist Society as part of the Church of England, and was in no way responsible for the separation which took place after his death in 1791. It was in the Conference at Manchester, 1795, four years after Wesley died, that the important link

which bound the Wesleyans to the Church of England was broken, by Wesleyan preachers being authorised to administer the Lord's Supper in chapels, as the Conference should appoint. The absence of Wesley's strong rule, and the disregard of his express wishes, were speedily felt in the divisions which took place.

In 1797 a large number of members seceded from the older body under a minister named Alexander Kilham, on the question of lay representation, and formed the *Methodist New Connexion.*

In 1810 the question of out-door preaching and female preachers caused another schism, which resulted in the formation, under Hugh Bourne, a lay preacher, of the *Primitive Methodists*, the first Conference being held in 1820.

In 1810 another party, who objected to a paid ministry, separated, and formed the *Independent Methodists.*

In 1815 another section, under the leadership of a local preacher named Bryan, severed themselves, because they preferred to sit at Holy Communion, and formed the Society known as *Bible Christians.*

In 1836 the *Wesleyan Methodist Association* arose from a difference of opinion on the training of ministers.

In 1849 there was another large secession from the older society, in consequence of the Conference expelling a number of ministers on a charge of insubordination. This gave rise to the *Wesleyan Methodist Reformers.*

The United Methodist Free Church was formed in 1857 by the amalgamation of portions of the two last named bodies.

The *Calvinistic Methodists*, whose chief strength is in Wales, originated mainly through the preaching of George Whitfield and Howel Harris, and formed a body in 1810.

Plymouth Brethren, a very exclusive body, had their rise in Dublin and Plymouth, about 1830, and became a distinct sect under the leadership of a Mr. Darby, and are sometimes described as Darbyites. The "Brethren" appear to witness against every other Christian community, considering themselves the "one assembly of God." They hold generally that the true idea of a Church excludes any outward visible organisation; disapprove all creeds and confessions of faith; reject a duly ordained ministry, and

hold that Christians have no need to ask for pardon of sin. The body does not appear to have any missionary organisation, either at home or abroad, and its members, who are mainly proselytes from other religious communities, are much divided amongst themselves.

Whilst deeply regretting the divisions which unhappily exist amongst those who "profess and call themselves Christians," we would, as did the bishops assembled at the Lambeth Conference in 1888, "gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake, and are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected." Said the late Archbishop Tait (1873), "It is not possible for me to hold the position which God has assigned to me in that Church which has generally been regarded as the bulwark of the Reformation, without praying for God's blessing on all earnest efforts to spread the great Gospel doctrines, which the Reformation vindicated. Never since the Reformation has it been more important that Christian men should learn to understand and co-operate with one another, and that they should by the manifestation of their union in faith and good works offer an effectual opposition to the growing progress of superstition and infidelity."

Whilst all earthly organisations and systems "have their day and cease to be," let it ever be remembered that the true church is, like her divine Lord and Master, eternal. She cannot perish; the "gates of hell shall not prevail against her," but in God's own good time, her earthly mission accomplished, she shall be perfected, "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

In the meantime, may it be ours to work for the good and pray for the peace of Jerusalem. May the spirit of love move on the troubled waters of religious differences. "From all false doctrine, heresy and schism; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness, good Lord deliver us."

Concluding Chapter.

"Stand therefore, having your loins girt about *with Truth*."

THE late Dean Hook has, in connection with the Romish controversy, a very suggestive sermon on the "Duty of contending for the Truth," * in which he vigorously condemns that expediency which would purchase peace at the cost of truth. "At the expense of attention, meditation, time, study, and prayer, the Christian is to buy the truth; and then, having obtained it, he is not only to hold it fast, but to assert it, and not only to assert it, but, if need shall be, earnestly to contend for it, to strive for it, to wrestle for it with those who attempt to pervert it—he is in duty bound to consider, not what is expedient at the moment for the sake of peace, but what is beneficial to the cause of truth." Then follow words which deserve careful attention. "To this worldly spirit of preferring peace to truth, instead of truth to peace, may be traced the advice so frequently given to the young, to avoid the consideration of controverted topics, and instead of employing themselves with a single eye in the discovery of the truth, to look out for points upon which they can agree with others; advice which, if taken literally, is absurd, and of which the wisdom may be fairly questioned if it be intended to refer to those doctrines concerning which disputes are rife at the present time."

* *The Church and its Ordinances.* Vol. 1, p. 181.

To the earnest seeker after truth, who, amid the confused utterances of the day, asks where it is to be found, the Church of England gives a clear and definite answer. She points to the sure foundation, declares the written Word of God to be the truth, the one rule of faith, and asserts that, like its Divine Author, that Word is unchangeable, and its authority supreme and absolute.

Truth is that which is opposed to the false and erroneous. Christ is the Revelation of the Truth—"I am the Truth." Christianity claims to be "the truth." To know the truth which Christ revealed is to know the Way to God (John xiv. 6). Truth is something which is not merely grasped by the intellect, it touches the life and impels to action. St. John says we *do* or *do not the truth*, and St. Paul frequently contrasts unrighteousness with truth. Truth is the right apprehension of the Word of God, and conformity of the life to its rules. Here is the secret of true freedom. "If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John viii. 31, 32.)

Now it is the Church's great mission to propagate God's Truth. She is its divinely appointed witness and keeper. To proclaim, defend, and hand on Divine Truth uncorrupted from generation to generation is the Church's sacred trust.

But truth has not only its opposers, it has its counterfeits. The old fable which pictures Falsehood as snatching up truth's attire and going about in disguise, is not without an application. Error is invariably founded upon some partial or perverted truth; indeed truth and error are oftimes so skilfully welded together as to deceive the unwary.

> "Truth and fiction are so aptly mixed,
> That all seems uniform and of a piece."

It is to be regretted that the ignorance or perversity of human nature should ever be ready to misrepresent and pervert truth: but so it is. Let it ever be remembered that the opinions of men and the utterances of public teachers are not necessarily God's truth. An honoured minister has suggestively said (on Joshua iii. 6), that as the Israelites "were to follow the priests as far as they carried the ark, but no further; so we must follow our ministers only as

they follow Christ." A great name must never be set against God's Holy Word. It is perfect, and cannot possibly have two contrary meanings. Whatever differences exist, therefore, are occasioned, not by the written Word, but by the shortcomings of those who profess to interpret it.

The foes of faith are increasingly active. The reality of our Lord's miracles is denied. The truth of the prophetic utterances of the Old Testament is questioned. The supernatural character of Christianity is rejected. Some would *rationalise* the Church of England by taking from her all doctrinal tests,* under the plea that a National Church, like the Roman Pantheon, should find room for every variety of opinion; others within the pale of the Church are earnestly endeavouring to "unprotestantise" and *Romanise*† her. A superstitious ritual is assisting the growth of a Christless creed. Many young and inquiring minds, perplexed by the conflicting theories of various teachers, are asking what truth is, and where it may be found, with the result indicated by Archbishop Thomson:—"Young men, amid the strife of tongues, hardly know what to believe, and are tempted to flee either to a gorgeous ritual with its show of reverence, or to a supercilious philosophy that holds all forms of religion cheap."

Under the guise of "Catholic" teaching, Romish and superstitious error has of late years made rapid progress. In many of our churches may be witnessed a ritual scarcely distinguishable from that of Rome, whilst (as Bishop Thirlwall says) "the doctrine is completely at variance with the mind of the Church of England, as expounded by her Articles, Liturgy, and Catechism."—(*Charges*, vol. i., p. 188.) The *Westminster Gazette* (Roman Catholic) said, in 1872, "The adoration of the Eucharist, the sacrifice of the Mass, the sacramental character of penance and confession, the

* Writing on this point the *Spectator* "regrets that the Thirty-nine Articles disfigure the formularies of the Church of England."

† "One black cloud is the continued existence in our midst of a body of Churchmen who appear determined, if words mean anything, to Romanise the Church of England, to go back behind the Reformation, to re-introduce the Mass and the Confessional into our communion, and, in one word, to revolutionise our Church."—(*Bishop Ryle's Charge*, Oct., 1884).

invocation of the Mother of God and of the saints, prayers and masses for the dead, are Christian verities which are not now denounced as idle fables or blasphemous inventions, but are permitted to be taught in the Protestant Church."

In such a crisis the duty of every loyal member of the Church is manifest. "We are a militant Church. It is the devil that persuades the soldier to sleep at his post." It is essential that all who love the truth should be provided with weapons for its defence, be ready always to warn and guide their fellows, and able "to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them." Here is the Apostolic motto—"We can do nothing against the truth but for the truth."

It is desired, in these concluding pages, to emphasise a few important points, some of which have already been referred to. This will afford an opportunity for introducing additional opinions of learned and honoured Churchmen.

I.—There are repeated and determined attempts to follow the lead of the late Dr. Pusey in MINIMISING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF ROME. This cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. The *Church Times* (Sept. 26th, 1884) says, "The three chief doctrinal differences between England and Rome are on Papal Supremacy, Mariolatry, and Image-worship." What, we ask, of Justification, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Prayer for the Dead, etc.? Compare the Thirty-nine Articles with the Canons of the Council of Trent. (See *ante*, pp. 43, 44.) Doubtless many of the ritualistic clergy have been led to disown the true principles of the Church of England, and to act and teach in nearly every particular as Romish priests,* under the influence of minds more powerful

* We make a careful distinction between High Churchmen and Ritualists. Whilst the old High Churchmen had a fondness for the theories of Apostolic Succession and Baptismal Regeneration, they had the highest possible regard for the leaders and principles of the Reformation. Let the writings of Hooker, Barrow, Beveridge, Hook, Burgon, Wordsworth, Goulburn, Lord Hatherley, and other High Churchmen, be compared with the weak, mawkish, and superstitious contents of Ritualistic Service Books and Manuals, and the distinction will be at once allowed. Dean Hook (in *Anglican Principles*) was very decided on this point. *Church Bells* says, "Ritualism is hardly distinguishable from Romanism—the Ritualists are *not* High Churchmen."

than their own. They have not taken the trouble to think for themselves. It is to be feared that a passage in a letter written by the late Princess Alice in 1874, correctly expresses a fact:—"This Catholic movement is *so un-English.* I think amongst these Ritualists there are *bonâ fide* Catholics who help to convert."—(*Memorials.*)

II.—Ritualism is not only a Romeward,* it is a ROMANISING MOVEMENT. If the teachings of Ritualism are right, those of Rome cannot be far wrong. If the teaching of Ritualism be correct, not a little of that in the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles is mistaken. To quote Bishop Thirlwall on ritualistic practices:—"The Communion Service of the Prayer Book is set, as it were, in the frame of the Roman Catholic Ceremonial, with all the accompaniments of the high or chanted Mass, vestments, lights, incense, postures, and gestures of the officiating clergy. It is interpolated with corresponding hymns, and supplemented by private prayers, translated from the Roman Missal. To make the resemblance more complete, several of the clearest directions of our own Rubric are disobeyed, and the Roman observance substituted for that appointed by our Church."—(*Charges*, vol. ii., p. 158.) A comparison of the *Directorium Anglicanum* and other Manuals used by Ritualistic clergy with the Prayer Book, fully bears out the bishop's statement. As with the Romanist, so with the Ritualist, the visible altar and the ministering priest are the one object of faith and sight—to these the preaching of the Gospel and everything else must be subordinated. The doctrine sought to be instilled is, No salvation, no heaven, apart from the priest. One of the distinctive prin-

* To the examples already given as to how Ritualism prepares for and leads to Rome (p. 14), may be added the following:—The Hon. Colin Lindsay, the first President of the English Church Union, became a Roman Catholic. At Prestbury the curate and 24 other persons left the Ritualistic Church for Rome. From one Brighton Church alone *five* clergy and a large number passed over to Rome. Said Bishop Durnford in a Charge (1878)—"The path to Rome has been smoothed for their converts by *excessive and illegal ritual.*" In 1884 was published a remarkable book, by a Roman Catholic, entitled "Converts to Rome." It contains the names of more than *three thousand persons* of the higher and middle classes of England (including many clergy) who have gone over to the Romish Church during the present century, and states that the number of converts is increasing largely every year.

ciples of Evangelical truth is the personal and direct access of the individual soul to God the Father, apart from the interposition of any earthly priest.

III.—THERE IS NO SACRIFICING PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—The theory that an earthly succession of priests offer, in the Lord's Supper, a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, was the starting point of the Tractarian movement. Men were told, as they still are, that the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament were essential to spiritual life, and could be effectually conveyed only by the hands of the priest. Now, any teaching which makes the salvation of men dependent on an earthly priesthood, we utterly reject as unscriptural. Nowhere does the New Testament apply the term "priest" to the Christian minister. "That the priest system (wrote the late Dr. Arnold) is not to be found in Scripture is as certain as that the worship of Jupiter is not the doctrine of the Gospel." This was also Hooker's opinion :—"Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be rightly applied?"—(*Eccl. Polity*, book v., chap. 78, sec. 3.) As already indicated (page 67), the clergy of the Church of England are ordained to be Christian ministers, not sacrificing priests.* The words "presbyter" and "priest" in the Prayer Book are interchangeable terms. In the Latin version of Articles XXIII., XXXII., and XXXVI., all of which refer to the ministry, the word *sacerdos*—a sacrificing priest—is not to be found. The three orders of the ministry are—*Episcopi, Presbyteri, et Diaconi.* We are ordained to be PRESBYTERS and deacons. Not a word is said at ordination about sacerdotal duties, but we are solemnly reminded that we are called to be "Messengers, Watchmen, Stewards." As Dean Perowne recently said, "We are, as Christian ministers, that which we were set apart to be at our ordination."—(*Sermons on the Church, etc.*, p. 22.) Words, clear and scriptural, of the late

* "On no subject has more serious error arisen from the confusion of language. The word "priest" has two different senses. In the one it is a synonym for presbyter or elder, and designates the minister who presides over and instructs a Christian congregation; in the other it is equivalent to the Latin *sacerdos*, the Greek ἱερεύς or the Hebrew *cohen*, the offerer of sacrifices, who also performs other mediatorial offices between God and man."—(*Bishop Lightfoot*, Philippians, p. 186.)

Archbishop Whately, shall close this important point :—"The Gospel-religion was introduced by men, and among men—whether Jews or Gentiles—who had never heard of or conceived such a thing as a religion without a sacrificing *priest*—without altars for *sacrifice*—without *sacrifices* themselves—without either a *temple*, or, at least, some high place, grove, or other sacred spot answering to a temple—some place, that is, in which the deity worshipped was supposed more especially to dwell. The Apostles preached for the first time—the first both to Jew and Gentile—a religion quite opposite in all these respects to all that had ever been heard of before—a religion without any sacrifice but that offered up by its Founder in His own person; without any sacrificing priest (Hiereus or Sacerdos) except Him, the great and true High Priest, and consequently with no priest (in that sense) on earth, except so far as every one of the worshippers was required to present himself as a 'living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God'; and a religion without any temple, except the collected congregation of the worshippers themselves."—(*On the Kingdom of Christ*, 5th Edit., pp. 105, 106.)

IV.—There being no sacrificing priesthood in the Church of England, it follows that there can be NO PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE FOR SIN MADE IN THE LORD'S SUPPER. The teaching of Ritualists on this subject is clearly antagonistic to both Scripture and the Prayer Book, and in almost exact agreement with the Romish doctrine, *e.g.* :—

Roman Catholic Church.

"I profess likewise that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and *propitiatory sacrifice* for the living and dead."—*Creed of Pope Pius* IV. Art. v.

"If any one saith that the Sacrifice of the Mass is, *etc.*, but not a *propitiatory sacrifice*, let him be accursed." *Council of Trent.* Sess. xxii. Can. 3.

Ritualistic Teaching.

"The Holy Eucharist is not merely commemorative. . . . It is *propitiatory*." —J. H. Blunt. *Dic. of Theology*, p. 671.

"Yes, I think I do offer a *propitiatory sacrifice*."—*Evidence of W. J. E. Bennett, before Ritual Commissioners.*

"I do not for one moment question that the Holy Eucharist is a *propitiatory sacrifice*."—Sermon by *J. J. Smith*, *Church Times*, Aug., 1884.

Further illustrations, with a statement of the declared doctrine of the Church of England, will be found *ante*, p. 95, etc. Two important opinions may be cited here. "That which the Council of Trent declares to be the true and proper sacrifice of the Mass, is an offering as to which our Church is absolutely silent."—(*Bishop Thirlwall. Charges*, vol. ii. p. 162.) "No sacrifice was offered by Christ at the institution of the Supper in the Upper Chamber. It was no place of sacrifice. There was no altar of sacrifice. It was an hour unlawful for sacrifice. The posture at which they reclined at meat was no posture of sacrifice. And Christ offered no words of sacrifice beyond the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which are the only sacrifices that the Church of England offers in the celebration of the Lord's Supper."—(*Dr. Stephens, in the Bennett Case.*)

V.—At the present day, frequent mention is made of the "Catholic Doctrine of EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE." By this is meant, not the offering of praise and thanksgiving; nor yet the self-consecration of the worshipper, but some act performed by the "priest" in the Lord's Supper. The Rev. W. J. E. Bennett,* with many who sympathise with him in doctrine, holds that the Lord's Table is an "Altar of Sacrifice, at which the ministering priests of the Church appear in a *sacerdotal position* at the celebration of Holy Communion; and that at such celebration there is a great

* On p. 112, will be found an extract from the Judgment of the Privy Council in the Bennett case. The *Church Times*, in reviewing the first edition of this work, said :—"Mr. Odom entirely keeps back the fact that Mr. Bennett's three main propositions—the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and Eucharistic Adoration—were one and all declared not to contravene the teaching of the Church of England; but to be legally tenable within its pale." Now it is quite true that the appeal against the decision of the Court of Arches (which had acquitted Mr. Bennett) was dismissed. Why this was done is incomprehensible, and can only be explained by those versed in legal subtleties, inasmuch as Mr. Bennett's teaching, as set forth in his own words, was almost identical with that of the Church of Rome. The *Times*, commenting on this Judgment, observed, "It is now established that a clergyman of the Church of England may teach any doctrines within limits, which only extreme subtlety can distinguish from Roman Catholicism." The fact is, Mr. Bennett altered his language, and cleverly explained his words away, and was allowed the benefit of a doubt.

sacrifice or offering of Jesus Christ by the ministering priest, and that in such sacrifice or offering, the mediation of Jesus ascends from such altar to plead for the sins of men."—(See *Ecclesiastical Judgments*, by Dr. Phillimore, p. 298.) It is asserted by the advocates of this theory, that the earthly priest at the "altar" is doing exactly what Christ is now doing in heaven, continually offering and re-presenting His Body and Blood before the Father. What grounds, it has been asked, are there for the assumption that Christ is offering a *continuous* sacrifice of His Body and Blood in heaven?* Bible authority there is none. Ritualistic writers differ on the point. Some are obliged to explain their own words away. Even Mr. Sadler, in *Church Doctrine*, admits that "the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist, most assuredly does not seem prominent in the Scriptures which teach us the nature of this sacrament" (p. 185). The typical teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews shows that *there was no altar* in the Most Holy place, the type of heaven.† And the same Epistle distinctly declares (ix. 28; x. 10-14) that "Christ was *once* offered"—"*once* for all!" This is confirmed by St. Paul, in Rom. vi. 10: "In that He died, He died unto sin *once*." And so our Church, in her Homilies and Communion Service, "He is that high or everlasting Priest, which hath offered Himself *once for all* upon the altar of the Cross, and with that one oblation hath made perfect for evermore them that are sanctified."—(*Homily of the Misery of Man.*) "Who made there—on the Cross—by His *one oblation* of Himself *once offered*, a full, perfect, and sufficient

* Our Lord's present work, as the High Priest of His Church, is the subject of able papers by Archdeacon Perowne, in the *Churchman* for 1883-4, and the *Clergyman's Magazine* for 1880.

† The *Church Times*, in reviewing the first edition, says we carefully "omit all reference to the revealed truth that the Apocalyptic vision assures us that heavenly worship is Ritualistic in exactly the same sense as the Levitical worship was, or as Catholic worship is now." We can only say that we do not accept the reviewer's assumption, and must leave the candid Bible student to look into the matter for himself. On this point we are glad to agree with an eminent Ritualist, Mr. Berdmore Compton, who says, "the whole idea of sacrifice, whether expiatory or Eucharistic, is absolutely repugnant to all we know of that Holy Place."—(*Catholic Sacrifice*, p. 58.)

sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, etc."—(*Com. Service.*) Article XXXI. of the Church uses almost the same words, and adds, "THERE IS NONE OTHER SATISFACTION FOR SIN, BUT THAT ALONE." Thus the teaching of Scripture and the Prayer Book is distinctly opposed to the doctrine of a continuous offering. Bishop Wordsworth writes:—"St. Paul says that Christ '*has* offered one sacrifice for sins for ever'; that is, one sacrifice available for ever—as the ancient expositors interpret the word. He does not say that He offered one perpetual sacrifice. A past act cannot be perpetual. But Christ HAS offered a sacrifice available in perpetuity. He says that Christ has done this, and that after He *had* done it, *He took His seat* at the right hand of God."—(*Commentary on Heb.* x. 12.) We have then a Great High Priest, but He is a Priest sitting "upon His throne" (Zech. vi. 13), *not* standing by an altar. That He is ever offering and re-presenting a propitiatory sacrifice, we cannot believe. He died "ONCE FOR ALL." The virtue and efficacy of His death is *everlasting*. He now exercises the priestly offices, not of sacrifice, but of mediation and intercession. "He ever liveth to make intercession for us." "Let us, therefore, come boldly unto the THRONE of Grace, that we may obtain mercy."—(Heb. iv. 16.)

VI.—Another so-called Catholic custom, of late years introduced into some of our churches is the USE OF INCENSE.* How strange there should be Churchmen who regard with favour a practice for which there is no Prayer Book authority, and which has been declared illegal in the Church of England. The advocates of this innovation plead the authority of antiquity, and quote Mal. i. 11 and Rev. viii. 3. All know that the use of incense was a part of the Jewish Ritual: it was also common during the pagan days of Rome. It was, however, not recognised by the Apostles,

* Mackeson's *Guide to the Churches of London* states that in 1884 incense was used in *fourteen* of these churches, as against ten in 1883. The use of incense during Divine Service was declared illegal by the Court of Arches in *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1868), and in *Bishop Sumner v. Wix*, 1870. The *Directorium Anglicanum* (p. 74) gives minute directions for the censing of the "Celebrant," the "Altar," the "Sacred Body," etc., at Holy Communion.

and was disapproved by the early Church. For three hundred years at least Christians abhorred the use of incense in worship as being associated with the worship of idols (*vide* Tertullian's *Apology*, c. 42.) A note to Dr. Stubbs' Edition of *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History* says:—"The Christian permitted its use at funerals against offensive smells. Afterwards it was used at the induction of magistrates and bishops, and also in public worship, to temper the bad air of crowded assemblies, *and at last degenerated into a superstitious rite.*" (Vol. I., p. 195). As to the language of Malachi, (which refers to the *spiritual* worship of the Gentiles), it may suffice to quote from two well-known Commentaries to show that the word incense is used in a symbolic sense. *Bishop Wordsworth* says:—"It has been supposed by some that this passage authorises and prescribes the use of *incense* in the Christian Church; but this seems to be a strained interpretation. If the word *incense* is to be taken literally, so ought the word *minchah*, or offering: in other words, if we are obliged to burn incense in our churches, we ought also to offer *fine flour*." (*Com. in loco.*) *Bishop Ellicott's Commentary* says:—"If therefore any Christians would claim this verse as a support for their custom of offering incense in church, they must conform also with Zech. xiv. 16-21, and go up every year to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles." To those who desire to tack on to Christian worship the Jewish and heathen practice of a bygone age, it may be said, we have no such custom. Catholic usage is against your innovations. We live in Gospel days. Let us strive to offer to the Great Giver of all, the "incense" of prayer and praise, and the "pure offering" of a godly, righteous, and sober life. "Let my prayer be set before Thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice." (Psalm cxli. 2.) The incense mingled with the prayers of the saints (Rev. viii. 3) speaks of the work and merits of Him *through whom* our prayers are acceptable to the Father.

VII.—Attention has already been called to the character of the teaching contained in RITUALISTIC SERVICE BOOKS AND MANUALS (*ante*, p. 9). Not long ago it devolved upon us to read, before a Clerical Society, a paper on "the Romanising tendencies of recent Ritualistic Manuals," when

it was clear that vast numbers of what Dean Goulburn calls "pious little books with a strong distillation of Romanism in them" were in circulation. A lady to whom a copy of the "English Catholic's Vade Mecum" was given by her vicar, showed it to friends with the word "POISON" written across the title page. New manuals of a like kind, compiled by Churchmen, frequently appear, a fact indicative of the large demand. *Church Bells*, in its notice of one, says:—"It is sad and sorrowful that such a book as this should be published by any members of the Church of England. *It abounds in some of the worst teachings of popery.*" In a book for young Churchwomen will be found the following lines to the Virgin Mary:—

"Mother of Mercy! day by day
My love of thee grows more and more;
Thy gifts are strewn upon my way,
Like sands upon the great sea shore.

Give me the grace to love thee more,
Jesus will give if thou wilt plead;
And, mother, when life's cares are o'er,
Oh, I shall love thee then indeed."

Here is a verse from a "Manual for Children":—

"Yes, I am going to God's priest
To tell him all my sin;
And from this very hour I'll strive
A new life to begin."

In the schools of St. Alban's, Holborn, is "the daily *Children's Mass*," and it is said (*Church Times*, July. 1891) that if the children of St. Peter's schools, London Docks, are asked which service they love the best, they unhesitatingly answer, "the Mass." In one book written for members of the Church of England, are suggestions for a rule of life, as these:—"Take less, or no sugar, butter, sweets," etc. "Do not smoke more than——daily." "Do some very decided act of humiliation or self-denial, such as kneeling and touching the ground with your forehead: lying on the floor with arms extended like a cross," etc.

We are bound to condemn all such teaching as anti scriptural, un-English, and repugnant to the principles of our Church. Bishop Fraser, in a letter (1885)

says :—"I cannot help feeling that it is time that people's eyes were opened to the fact that a system of teaching is spreading amongst us which is not that of the Prayer Book, and means to go behind the principles of the Reformation."

VIII.—Another subject which demands a word is EVENING COMMUNION. It is painful to hear of clergy—advocates generally of *fasting* communion*—speaking of evening communion as "wicked," "sacrilege," "Christ-dishonouring." Quite recently, the principal of a theological college advised a student to decline a most desirable curacy because evening communion obtained in the church. Now, whatever may have been the general practice in the middle ages, the writings of the Fathers prove beyond doubt that evening communions were the rule at first, and that they continued to be common in the early Church for a long time. Mosheim says that in the third century, a period when Christians generally had edifices in which they assembled for religious worship, "the time of its administration was different according to the state and circumstances of the Churches. Some deemed the morning, some the afternoon, and some the evening, to be the most suitable time for its celebration."—(*Eccl. History*, Stubbs' edition, Book 1, cen. iii. c. iv.) "It must be admitted (says Dean Goulburn) that no exception whatever can be taken against evening communion, either from the Holy Scriptures, or from the Book of Common Prayer, or from the Constitutions and Canons of the Church of England."—(*Communion Office*, Second edition, p. 303.) To say, as some now do, that it is sinful to administer in the evening a sacrament instituted by our Blessed Lord Himself *at even* (Matt. xxvi. 20), is to lay down a rule at variance alike with Scripture and reason. What matters the hour at which we approach the Lord's Table, so long as we draw near with faith, and take the Holy Sacrament to our comfort!

IX.—We have indicated some phases of the so-called Catholic teaching, which have been introduced step by step into the Church of England. True Catholic teaching is *Scriptural* teaching. When it is asked what Catholic doc-

* "If Fasting Communion be of such vital importance as some pretend, would not our Prayer Books have told us so?"—(Dean Goulburn, *On the Communion Office*, p. 297.)

trine is, the usual reply is in the oft-quoted rule, "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*"—that which has been received "always, everywhere, by all." But who are the *all* whose belief is to rule? Canon Carter says, in reply, "The general body of the Church." Well, then, taking it thus, is it not easily proved that many points of Ritualistic teaching have not *always* and *everywhere* been held by *all* Christians, and therefore cannot be correctly designated Catholic? Rather let us quote *in full*, and act upon the famous passage—the definition of the idea of true tradition—given by Vincentius of Lirinum, "*Magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*"—"*we must be very careful* to hold that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all" (*i.e.*, by *all Christians*). We must be careful to test the teachings of men, as did the Bereans, and as the Church of Christ has ever done, with the touchstone of Scripture. If they do not stand this test, they must be rejected.—(See Articles VI., XX., XXI., Church of England.)

X.—We declare our belief in "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," and earnestly desire to uphold Catholic truth. At the same time, we are PROTESTANTS, and are not ashamed of the name. "They are the Protestants (observes Bishop Stillingfleet) who stand for the ancient and undefiled doctrine of the Catholic Church against the novel and corrupt tenets of the Roman Church." Dean Hook says:—"We will love the Church of England, not for her Catholicism only, but for her Protestantism also; for the title of Protestant stands in antagonism, not to Catholicism, as deceivers teach, but to Romanism. We glory in our title of Protestant, for, by that title we proclaim to all the world that we protest against 'the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also invocation of saints' (Art. XXII.); not only do we declare these things to be 'repugnant to the Word of God,' but we protest against the Romish violation, both of Scriptural and of primitive practice, in withholding the cup in the Lord's Supper from the people," etc., etc.—(*The Church and her Ordinances*, vol. i. p. 290.) We desire to emphasise the fact that Protestantism, as understood and taught by Evangelical

Churchmen, is not the mere negation it is sometimes falsely represented to be. The charge that its principles are destructive and not constructive, is rebutted by history. It rejoices in the possession of great, active, and lifegiving principles. Protestant Churchmen distinctly assert that direct and positive doctrine alone can take hold of the heart. "The soul's life depends, not upon the error it avoids, but upon the doctrines it actively accepts." To the summary of views of Evangelical Churchmen already given (p. 48), may be added the three great distinctive principles of Evangelicalism as set forth by Canon Garbett:—"The first is the personal contact of the soul with God, in distinction to the corporate conception of the Church, which holds that the life of Christ is communicated in the first place to the body, the Church, and thence is communicated again to individual members of it. The second principle is the sovereignty of God the Holy Ghost, in contrast with the view which limits His ordinary working to ordinances and sacraments. The third principle is the sole High Priesthood of the Lord Jesus Christ, in contrast with the sacerdotal view of the Christian ministry which, maintaining the singleness of the meritorious sacrifice, yet maintains also its re-presentation before God by the hands of the earthly priest."—(Introduction, *Evangelical Principles.*) Let us be Protestant in the sense declared by our Prayer Book and Articles. Protestantism is the love of moral, intellectual, and spiritual freedom; and, more, it is the determination, in the strength of God, to strive for and defend the same. Thank God, this spirit of Protestantism lives in the English Church to-day, a power which must assert itself so long as error shall exist. "I fully sympathise (writes Bishop Thirlwall) with the indignation which has been roused by the arbitrary misuse of the word 'Protestantism,' by which its meaning has been limited to a mere negation of everything that men on both sides profess to revere. But still it seems evident that those who so misuse the word, can only be understood according to the sense which they themselves, however unwarrantably, attach to it; and that their meaning is perverted if what they say of Protestantism is applied to what others, in a very different sense, call the Protestant religion."—(*Charges*, vol. i. p. 46.)

The warning of a leading review (the *Quarterly*, Oct., 1878) should not be lightly regarded. "When the clergy abjure Protestantism, they will abjure all sympathy with one of the primary movements of English life; their Church will cease to be the Church of England, and they will sink into the condition of an ultramontane priesthood amidst a contemptuous laity."

The quaint and forcible words uttered by Bishop Latimer, at St. Paul's Cross, more than 300 years ago, are well worthy of remembrance. After condemning the worldliness and apathy of many within the Church; and speaking of the good seed which should be sown in God's field, he describes the increasing activity of Satan, in sowing the seeds of disunion and false doctrine thus:—"The devil is the most diligent preacher of all other; he is never out of his diocese; he is never from his cure; you shall never find him unoccupied; he is ever in his parish; he is ever at his plough. His office is to hinder religion; to maintain superstition; to set up idolatry; to teach all kind of popery. . . . Where the devil is resident and hath his plough going: there away with books, and up with candles; away with Bibles, and up with beads; away with the light of the Gospel, and up with the light of candles; yea, at noonday. Where the devil is resident, that he may prevail, up with all superstition and idolatry, censing, painting of images, candles, palms, ashes, holy water, and new service of men's inventing—as though man could invent a better way to honour God with than God Himself hath appointed. Up with decking of images, and gay garnishing of stocks and stones; up with man's traditions, and his laws; down with God's traditions, and His most Holy Word."—(*Sermon on the Ploughers*, A.D. 1549.)

We have travelled over a difficult path in stormy and eventful days. With much to cheer and encourage, yet with many divisions within the Church, and determined foes without, the outlook is not unlike that in the prophetic age—the light is not "clear nor dark." The words of prophet and apostle enjoin watchfulness, diligence, faithfulness, and prayer. "The simple believeth every word; but the prudent man looketh well to his going" (Prov. xiv. 15). "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk

therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls" (Jer. vi. 16). The day is coming when truth will be fully manifest. "At evening time it shall be light."

That Churchmen are divided is a lamentable fact. Liberationists point at our Church as "a house divided against itself." Roman Catholics speak of the English Church as one "which has enlarged its standing ground to hold opposing doctrines, and to admit a variety of contradictory opinions." Yet, notwithstanding all the Church's shortcomings, there is abundant evidence that God is still with her. "Perplexed, but not in despair," she is doing a noble work for Christ. We pray for the peace of Jerusalem. For true unity, the unity of the Spirit, we long. Uniformity is neither possible nor desirable; for whilst human nature remains as at present, there must be divergencies of thought. That a variety of opinion may be consistent with honest and loyal Churchmanship, has been proved a thousand times over. Unity founded on a compromise of truth with error is not worth having. Our religious belief should be clear and definite. We have too much vague and confused teaching. Definite Church teaching on the lines of the Bible, Prayer Book, and Articles, is one of the great needs of the day. The Church of England has a Creed, also defined limits, and, as Bishop Lightfoot observed at the Leicester Congress (1880), "adherence to the fundamental principles of the Catholic Creed, and loyalty to the Church in which they minister, must be demanded of all."

It is not enough to wage war against error. There must be an apprehension and a manifestation of truth. "Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church." "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven; but he that DOETH the will of My Father which is in heaven" (Matt. vii. 21). Let it ever be remembered, that in the search for truth, there can be no help save from what is true. "*Thy Word is Truth.*" We live in an unreal age, with many false notions abroad. Let us, as members of the Church of England, seek to be real. Let us be what we seem to be. "Have your loins girt about with truth—truth in action, truth in speech, truth in manner, truth in heart, truth in thought." Followers of and workers for Him who is "the Truth, the Life, and the Way!"

We would close these pages—which we trust may claim to have been written in the interests of truth, and not of party—with the weighty and eloquent words of the honoured Archbishop to whom they are dedicated. "Vainly we strain our eyes into the future; we can see nothing. But the Divine Lord, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, has promised to be with us alway, even unto the end of the world; and no harm can threaten us which He is not strong enough to conquer for us. Meantime our responsibility is enormous. The recognised teacher of a nation so mighty in the eyes of the world, a city set upon a hill that cannot be hid, the Church of England ought to fear lest she come short of the duties that belong to such an eminence. Fearless for the future, we have much cause to fear for the want of devotion to our work. What holiness of heart and life, what love and peace towards each other, belong to such an office! Millions look to us for the bread of life; millions ten times told, feel the yoke of England's laws, but refuse England's gospel. Lord, if Thou spurnest us unworthy, yet for a while may that season, long or short, be full of fruit for Thee! Show Thyself amongst us as our present leader, and may we that enter Thy presence sanctify to Thee our hearts and lives, because holiness becometh Thine house for ever. When Thou breathest on us the blessing of peace, may it find us the sons of peace, so that the blessing may rest upon us. Put to rest, O Lord, our unhappy strifes and divisions; and as we stand before Thy face, may we remember nothing but Thy great love for us, and our great commission to teach our people to know Thee, Saviour, Lord, God, blessed for ever."

Keep, we beseech Thee, O Lord, Thy Church with Thy perpetual mercy: and because the frailty of man without Thee cannot but fall, keep us ever by Thy help from all things hurtful, and lead us to all things profitable to our salvation; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Chronological Table of Events.

A.D.

304 Martyrdom of St. Alban at Verulam.
314 Council of Arles. Three British bishops present.
325 Council of Nicæa. Nicene Creed framed.
563 Columba, an Irish Missionary, preaches in Scotland.
596 Augustine came to England from Rome.
597 Augustine consecrated first Archbishop of Canterbury.
604 See of London founded.
627 Paulinus consecrated Bishop of York.
734 Egbert first Archbishop of York.
735 The Venerable Bede dies.
787 Doctrine of Transubstantiation asserted at Nicæa.
1074 Celibacy of clergy enforced in the Roman Church.
1085 Use of Sarum drawn up by Bishop Osmund.
1126 Archbishop of Canterbury becomes the Pope's Legate.
1139 Festival of the Immaculate Conception established.
1164 Constitutions of Council of Clarendon.
1170 Thomas à Becket murdered in Canterbury Cathedral.
1203 Adoration of the Host first prescribed.
1213 King John cedes his kingdom to the Pope.
1215 The *Magna Charta* signed.
1247 Grossetete resists Papal exactions.
1283 First Convocation with diocesan proctors.
1384 Death of John Wyclif.
1415 The Cup denied to the laity.
1476 Caxton sets up the first Printing Press at Westminster.
1509 Henry VIII. succeeds to the Throne.
1526 *First* English New Testament (Tyndale's) published.
1533 Cranmer made archbishop.
1534 Papal supremacy abolished in England.
1535 Miles Coverdale's Bible published.
1536 The "Ten Articles" put forth.
1537 Matthews' (Rogers) Bible published.
1539 Cranmer's, or the Great Bible published.
1544 The English Litany first used.
1545-1563 Council of Trent.
1547 Accession of Edward VI. English Bible set up in Churches. First Book of Homilies published.
1548 Communion in both kinds restored.
1548 Communion Service in English published.
1549 First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

1552 Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. The Forty-two Articles published.
1553 Mary succeeds to the Throne, and re-establishes Romanism.
1555-6 Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, and many others burnt.
1558 Accession of Elizabeth.
1559 Prayer Book revised.
1562 The Thirty-nine Articles agreed upon.
1563 The Second Book of Homilies published.
1594-1597 Hooker publishes his Ecclesiastical Polity.
1603 James I. crowned king.
1604 The Hampton Court Conference. The (141) Canons published.
1607-1611 Our present Bible revised and published.
1620 The Pilgrim Fathers land in New England.
1633 Laud made Archbishop of Canterbury. Laud orders the Communion Table to be set altar-wise.
1644 The Prayer Book suppressed by the Long Parliament.
1660 Restoration of the Monarchy.
1661 The Savoy Conference.
1662 Prayer Book revised as now. Act of Uniformity. Ejectment of Nonconforming clergy.
1689 The Toleration Act, 1 William and Mary, chap. 18.
1698 Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge founded.
1701 Society for the Propagation of the Gospel incorporated.
1704 Queen Anne gives Tenths and First-fruits to the Church.
1781-2 Sunday Schools first established in England.
1791 John Wesley died.
1799 Church Missionary Society instituted.
1804 British and Foreign Bible Society established.
1811 National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor founded.
1833 The Tractarian movement commenced at Oxford.
1836 Church Pastoral Aid Society instituted.
1837 Additional Curates Society established.
1843 Church Sunday School Institute established.
1852 Convocation re-commences to sit.
1854 Roman Church proclaims the Immaculate Conception.
1859 State Services for January 30th, May 29th, and November 5th discontinued.
1869 The Irish Church disestablished.
1870 The Infallibility of the Pope decreed.
1870 The Table of Lessons re-constructed.
1872 Shortened forms of Service authorised.

GENERAL INDEX.

Absolution, priestly, 116.
Additional Curates Society, 170.
Adoration of the Elements, 113
Agnosticism, 1.
Aidan, St., 35.
Alban, St., 34.
Alford, Dean, quoted, 68, 87, 111.
"Altar" in Hebrews xiii. 10: Opinions of Dean Alford, Professor Davidson, Canon Farrar, Dr. Kay, Dr. Lange, and Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, 111, 112.
Anglo-Saxon Church, 35.
Ancient Liturgies, 151.
Apostolic Church, 31.
Apostolic Succession, 53, 56.
Apostolic Succession: Opinions of Dean Alford, 68; Dean Goulburn, 54; Archdeacon Hare, 55; Dean Hook, 54; John Keble, 53; Bishop Lightfoot, 68; F. Myers, 55; Archbishop Whately, 55, 56; *Church Quarterly*, 54.
Arles, Council of, 35.
Articles, The Thirty-nine, 40, 61, 164.
Articles, compared with Canons of Trent, 43-45.
Articles: Opinions of Bishops Barry, Beveridge, Burnet, Stillingfleet, and Wordsworth, 40, 41.
Article VI., 20, 41, 43; VIII., 163; IX., X., XI., and XIII., 43; XVII., 24; XVIII., 44; XIX., 20, 24, 59; XX., 41; XXI., 41, 179,; XXII., 43, 199; XXIII., 57, 191; XXIV. and XXV., 44, 73; XXVI., 61, 76; XVII., 39, 85; XXVIII., 97; XXX., 44; XXXI., 45, 97, 195; XXXII., 191; XXXIV., 160; XXXVI., 191; XXXVII., 39, 45, 144.
Arnold, Dr., quoted, 191.
Augustine, St., quoted, 20, 71, 76, 88, 109, 110, 130.
Augustine in England, 34,; Archbishop of Canterbury, 35; letter to Pope Gregory, 151.
Auricular Confession, 116-129.
Auricular Confession introduced into England, 38.
Auricular Confession, Romish doctrine of, 117; Ritualistic teaching on, 119, 197; Convocation on, 125; Homilies on, 123; Prayer Book on, 120.
Auricular Confession: Opinions of Bishop Barry, 122, 123; Bishop Blomfield, 127; Bishop H. Browne, 127; R. Hooker, 126; Bishop W. W. How, 127; Dr. Pusey, 118; Archbishops Tait and Thomson, 125; Dean Vaughan, 128; Bishop Wilberforce, 116; Bishop Christ. Wordsworth, 117; Bishop S. Wilberforce, 129*a*.

Baptism, Holy, 78-93.
Baptism, Administration of, 80.

Baptism, Church Catechism on, 80; Council of Trent on, 82; Calvin, John, on, 87; Mozley, Professor, on, 165.
Baptismal Regeneration, 81.
Baptismal Regeneration: Opinions of Dean Alford, 87; G. S. Faber, 82; Dean Goode, 83; Dr. Jelf, 81; M. F. Sadler, 82; Dean Vaughan, 90.
Baptists, The, 182.
Barrow, Dr. Isaac, quoted, 26.
Barry, Bishop, quoted, 41, 53, 90, 122, 123, 149.
Bede's Ecclesiastical History, 152.
Bennett, W. J. E., quoted, 62; 101, 192.
Bennett Case, The, 112, 193,
Benson, Archbishop, quoted, 21.
Bertha, Queen, 35.
Beveridge, Bishop, quoted, 30, 32, 37, 110.
Bible Christians, The, 184.
Bibles, English, 153, 154.
Bickersteth, Bishop, quoted, 48.
Binding and loosing, 66.
Bingham, Joseph, quoted, 150.
Birmingham Church Extension, 168.
Bishop of London's Fund, 170.
Bishops, duties of, 46.
Bishops, number of, 167.
Black Rubric, The, 100, 157.
Blackstone on Endowments, 140.
Blakeney, R. P., quoted, 150.
Blomfield, Bishop, quoted, 4, 126.
Blunt, J. H., quoted, 63, 150.
Books on Church History and Doctrine, *preface* xiv.
Bradwardine, Archbishop, 39.
British Church, Early, 34, 38, 151.
British Critic, The, 14.
Browne, Bishop H., on Confession, 127.
Burgon, Dean, quoted, 18, 19, 148, 149.
Burnet, Bishop, on the Articles, 36.

Calvin, on Baptism, 87.
Carter, Canon, quoted, 119, 199.
Case for Disestablishment, 141-2.
"Catholic," meaning of, 30, 199.
"Catholic," Teaching and Ritual, 12, 17, 18, 188.
Catholic League, The 13.
Catechism, The, 164.
Catechism on Baptism, 80.
Catechism on the Lord's Supper, 98.
Celtic Mission, The, 36.
Ceremonies, illegal, 3.
Christian Knowledge Society, 170.
Chronological table, 204.
Church, definition of word, 22, 23; "One," 29; "Apostolic," 31; "Catholic," 30; "Holy," 32.
Church, defined by Article XIX., 24; by the Homily, 29; by Dr. Barrow, 26; Bishop Beveridge, 30, 32; T. P. Garnier, 24; R. Hooker, 25; Professor Jowett, 27; Bishop Pearson, 32; Bishop Perowne, 30; M. F. Sadler, 24; Bishop Stevens, 30; Bishop Jeremy Taylor, 25; Dean Vaughan, 26; Bishop Christ. Wordsworth, 26.
Church of England, 34-50; Ancient, 34; Catholic, 40; Protestant, 42*a*; National, 41; Statistics of Churches and Clergy, 166, 167; Educational Work, 171; Mission Work, 169.
Church History and Polity, books on, *preface* xiv.
Church Extension, 168.
Church and State, 42, 136, 147; Dr. Dollinger on, 41; Lord Eldon, 39; R. Hooker, 138, Dean McNeile, 146; Dr. Paley, 138; W. E. Gladstone, 42; Dean Stanley, 147; Archbishop Thomson, 146; Bishop Warburton, 138.
Church S. S. Institute, 173.
Church Bells, quoted, 189, 197.

Churchman, The, quoted, 194.
Church Kalender, 10.
Church Quarterly, quoted, 54.
Church Review, quoted, 8.
Church Times, quoted, x., 9, 13, 105, 131, 189, 193, 194, 197.
Church Year Book, 166-169.
Church Missionary Society, 169.
Church Pastoral Aid Society, 169.
Clergy, number of, 167.
Clergy List, quoted, 167.
Cloveshoo, Council of, 152.
Coleridge, Lord, on Blasphemy Laws, 2.
Collects, The, 150, 163.
Colonial Church Society, 169.
Columba St., 36.
Condor, E. R., on Church and State, 140.
Confession, *see Auricular* Confession,
Confirmation, 90, Number confirmed, 169.
Confirmation, R. Hooker on, 91; Dean Vaughan, 92.
Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, 12.
Congregationalists, The, 181.
Congregation in Church, 11.
Controversy in Religion, viii., 21, 186.
Converts to Rome, 15, 190.
Convocation on Confession, 125.
Coronation Oath, The, 42*b*.
Council of Trent, *see Trent*.
Cosin, Bishop, quoted, 46.
Creeds, The Three, 162.
Creed of Pope Pius IV., 74, 178.
Cromwell, Church under, 158.

DAVENANT, Bishop, quoted, 21.
Davidson, Bishop, quoted, 8.
Davidson, Professor, quoted, 111.
Dale's *Congregational Principles*, 145.
Day Schools, Church, 171.
Dead, Prayer for, 12, 14, 130-135; Homily on, 133; Ritualistic Teaching, 131; Bishop Wordsworth on, 134.
"*Dead Hand*" *in the Free Churches, The*, 143.
Directorium Anglicanum, 9, 62, 102, 195.
Directory, The, 158.
Disestablishment and Disendowment, 2, 42, 136; Ritualists on, 9; Liberationists, 42, 142; Dr. Freeman on, 140.
Döllinger, Dr., quoted, 42.

ECCLESIASTICAL Commission, The, 140.
Ecclesiastical Commission, Private Benefactions to, 141.
Edward VI., King, 154.
Edward VI., King, Prayer Books of, 155-56.
Educational Work of the Church, 171.
Elizabeth, Queen, 157.
Ellicott's, Bishop, *Commentary*, 86, 199.
Endowments, 42, 140.
England, Church of, 34-50.
English Catholic's Vade Mecum, extracts, 106, 119, 131, 197.
English Church Union, 12.
Englishman's Brief for the National Church, 143.
Established Church, advantages of, 145; W. E. Gladstone on, 42.
Ethelbert, King, 35.
Eucharistic Sacrifice, 193.
Evangelical Principles, 48, 200.
Evening Communion, 12; Dean Goulburn and Mosheim on, 198.

FABER, G. S., quoted, 81, 82.
Farrar, Dr., quoted, 65, 112.
Fasting Communion, 198.
Fenelon's Letters, 120.
Fraser, Bishop, quoted, 159, 197.
Freeman, Dr., on Disestablishment, 140.

GARBETT, Canon, on Evangelical Principles, 200.

Gelasius, Pope, 117.
Gibbon on Roman Worship, 1.
Gladstone, W. E., on English Reformation, 39; Church and State, 42; Romanism, 180.
Goode, Dean, on Infant Baptism, 83.
Gorham Case, The, 83.
Goulburn, Dean, quoted, 54, 150, 163, 197, 198.
Grossette, Bishop, 35.
Great Bible, The, 153.
Guardian, quoted, 9, 167, 173.
Guardian, Dr. Hook's Letter, 17.

HAMPTON Court Conference, 158,
Hare, Archdeacon, quoted, 55, 107.
Hebrews, Epistle to, on "Altar," 111; on Jewish Ritual, 63.
Henry VIII, death of, 154.
High Churchmen, Who are, 189.
Hook, Dean, quoted, vii., 17, 54, 186, 187, 199.
Hooker, R., quoted, 25, 65, 75, 91, 110, 138, 191.
Homilies, The, 154.
Homilies, quoted, on the Church, 29; the Sacraments, 72; the Lord's Supper, 100; Confession, 123; Prayer for the Dead, 133.
Hospital Sunday Statistics, 143.
Hull Church Extension, 168.

INCENSE, Use of, 195; Illegal in English Church, 195.
Independents, The 181.
Infant Baptism, 89.
Infant Baptism, Origen on, 89; Dean Vaughan on, 90.
Injunctions of 1547, 155.
Iona and Lindisfarne, 36.
Irenæus on the Church, 27.
Irish Ecclesiastical Record, quoted, 16.
Irving, E., on the Sacraments, 72.

JACOBSON, Bishop, on the Catechism, 164.
James I., King, 157.
Jelf, Dr., on Baptismal Regeneration, 81.
Jewel, Bishop, on the Lord's Supper, 97.
Jowett, Professor, on the Church, 27, (*note.*)

KAY, Dr., on Heb. xiii., 10, 112.
Keble, John, 14, 53.
Keys, Power of the, 66; Dean Alford on, 68; Dean Goulburn, 67; Bishop Lightfoot, 68; Bishop Westcott, 66; Dean Vaughan, 66.
LAMBETH Conference, 41, 185.
Lambeth Judgment, 8.
Lange, Dr., quoted, 111.
Langton, Archbishop, 39.
Lateran Council, The 117.
Latimer, Bishop, on Popery, 201.
Leeds Church Extension, 168.
Leeds, St. Saviour's, 15.
Liberation Society, 42, 141.
Lightfoot, Bishop, J. B., quoted, 36, 51, 68, 70, 191.
Litany, The, 162.
Liturgical Forms, 148.
Littledale, Dr., quoted, 42*a* 107.
Little Prayer Book, The 106.
Liverpool, Church Extension in Diocese of, 168.
Longley, Archbishop, quoted, 111.
London, Church Extension 168.
Lord's Supper, The, 94. 115, 192.
Lord's Supper, The: Teaching of Ritualists on, 101-103, 192; of Roman Catholics, 96, 179.
Lord's Supper, The: The Articles on, 97; the Catechism on, 98; Communion Service, 99; the Homilies, 100, 105.
Lord's Supper, The: Bishop Beveridge, 110; R. Hooker, 110; Bishop Jewel, 97; Archbishop Longley, 111; Dean Vaughan, 113; Bishop Waterland, 110.
Lord's Supper, The; Judgment of Privy Council on, 112.

Lowder, "Father," 15.

Macaulay, Lord, quoted, 158.
Mackeson's *Churches of London*, 195.
Mackonochie, Rev. A. H., 9, 101.
Magee, Bishop, quoted, 6, 159.
Magna Charta, 39.
Manchester, Church Extension in Diocese of, 168.
Manning, Dr., on Ritualism, 4.
Manuals, Ritualistic, 9; extracts from, 9-11, 95, 102, 103, 106, 119, 197.
Martin v. Mackonochie, 195.
Mary, Accession of, 157.
Mass, The, 13, 18, 95, 193.
Masses for the Dead, 132.
Matthew's Bible, 153.
McIlvaine, Bishop, quoted, 21.
McNeile, Dean, quoted, 146.
Mede, J., quoted, 105.
Mediæval Teaching, 107.
Ministry, The Christian, 51-70,
Ministry, The Christian, Dean Alford on, 64; Dr. Farrar, 65; Bishop Lightfoot, 51, 191; Bishop Perowne, 64, 191.
Mission Work of the Church of England, 169.
Moncrieff, Lord, on Disestablishment, 146.
Morton's, Bishop, *Catholic Appeal*, 130, 132.
Mosheim on Evening Communion, 198; the Use of Incense, 196.
Mozley, Professor, on the Baptismal Service, 165.
Moule, H. C. G., quoted, 27, 42*a*.
Myers, F., on Apostolic Succession, 55.

National Society, The, 171.
Nationality of Church, 41.
Newman, J. H., 14, 130.
Newton J., on the Prayer-Book, 160.
Nicæa, Council of, 35.
Nicene Creed, 163.
"Notes" of the Church, 29, 32
Nowell's Catechism, 164.

Oath, Coronation, 42*b*.
Oaths on Ordination, 61.
Ollivant, Bishop, quoted, 5.
Order of Divine Service, 10.
Ordination Services, 57, 191.
Origen on Infant Baptism, 89.
Osmund, Bishop, 152.

Paley, Dr., on Church and State, 138.
Pall Mall Gazette, quoted, 17.
Papal Supremacy, 38.
Pardon through the Blood, 11.
Paulinus, Archbishop, 37.
Paschasius, Radbert, 107.
Pearson, Bishop, quoted, 32.
Perowne, Bishop, quoted, 30, 64, 65, 160, 191.
Plymouth Brethren, 184.
Pontifical, The, 152.
Prayer Book, History of, 154.
Prayer Book, Compilers of, 156.
Prayer Book Revisions, 155-160.
Prayer Book Revision, 159.
Prayer for the Dead, 130-135.
Presbyterians, The, 180.
"Presbyter," and "Priest," 57, 64.
Priesthood, 62-78, 191.
Priesthood, Dean Alford on, 64; Dr. Arnold, 171; W. J. E. Bennett, 62; J. H. Blunt, 63; Dr. Farrar, 65; R. Hooker, 65; Bishop Lightfoot, 51, 191; Bishop Perowne, 64, 65, 191; M. F. Sadler, 62; Dean Vaughan, 66; Bishop Westcott, 66; Archbishop Whately, 192.
Priest in Absolution, 119.
Priest's Prayer Book, 10, 103, 119.
Primer, The, 154.
Procter, *History of the Prayer Book*, 158.
"Protestant," Origin and Meaning of, 42*a*, 199.
"Protestant," Dean Hook on 42*a*, 199; Dr. Luthardt, 43*b*; Bishop Thirlwall, 200; Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, 42*a*; *Quarterly Review*, 201.

Protestant Succession, The, 42*b*.
Pusey, Dr., 5, 10, 11, 42*b*, 101, 116, 118, 189.
Purgatory, 130.
Puritans, The, 157 181.

QUAKERS, The, 182.
QUARTERLY REVIEW on Protestantism, 201 ; on Ritualism, 8 (*note*).

REAL PRESENCE, The, 101-114.
Real Presence, Ritualistic teaching on, 101, 106, 107.
Real Presence, St. Augustine on, 110 ; Bishop Beveridge, 110 ; R. Hooker, 110 ; Archbishop Longley, 111; Dean Vaughan, 113 ; Dr. Waterland, 110 ; Bishop Westcott, 109.
Real Presence : *The Bennett Judgment*, 112.
Record, The, quoted, 40, 143. 175.
Reformation, The, 38, 154.
Reformation, W. E. Gladstone on, 39.
Regeneration, 84 ; St. Augustine on, 88 ; Dean Alford, 87 ; Calvin, 87 ; G. S. Faber, 82 ; R. Hooker, 76 ; Dr. P. Schaff, 85 ; Archbishop Usher, 88 ; Bishop Perowne, 82 ; Professor Watkins, 86 ; Bishop Westcott, 86 ; Dr. Whitaker, 72.
Religious Denominations. 175.
Renan, M., 11.
Revision of Prayer Book, 159.
Ritualism, 2-18, 188.
Ritualism : Opinions of Bishop Blomfield, 4 ; Dean Burgon, 16 ; Bishop Durnford, 190 ; Dean Hook, 17 ; Bishop Magee, 6 ; Dr. Manning, 4 ; Bishop Ollivant, 5 ; Bishop Ryle, 188 ; Archbishop Tait, 6 ; Archbishop Thomson, 6 ; Bishop Thirlwall, 5, 190 ; Bishop Wilberforce, 6 ; Bishop Vaughan, 15 ; Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, 6.
Ritualism : A Romeward and Romanising Movement, 7, 14, 190.
Ritualistic Converts to Rome, 4, 5, 14, 190.
Ritualistic Manuals, 9, 197.
Roman Catholics, The 176.
Robertson, Canon, *Church History*, quoted, 108.
Ryle, Bishop, quoted, 47, 137, 144, 188.

SACRAMENTS, The, 71-77.
Sacraments, The, defined, *Article* XXV., 73 ; in the *Catechism*, 73 ; by the *Homilies*, 72 ; St. Augustine, 74 ; R. Hooker, 75 ; Bishop J. Taylor, 75 ; Dr. Whitaker, 75 ; Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, 76.
Sacraments, The : Church of Rome on, 74, 179.
Sacrament of Baptism, 78-93.
Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 94-115.
Sadler, M. F., quoted, 24, 62, 82, 104, 194.
Sacrifice, Propitiatory, 102-104, 192.
Sacrifice of the Mass, 100, 173.
Sacrifice, Eucharistic, 173.
Salmon, Dr., quoted, 42*a*.
Sarum, Use of, 152.
Savoy, Conference, 158.
Schaff, Dr. quoted, 85.
Schism, 17, 55 (*note*).
Secessions to Rome, 3, 5, 14, 190.
Sheffield Church Extension, 168.
"Six Points" of Ritualism, 8.
Soame's *Anglo-Saxon Church*, 35
Speaker's Commentary, quoted, 66, 86, 109, 113.
Spectator, The, on the Thirty-nine Articles, 188.
Spires, Council of, 42*a*.
Sponsors at Baptism, 90.

Sponsors, Bishop Barry on, 90.
Spurgeon, C. H. quoted, 142, 145, 149.
Statistics: Bishops, 167; Benefices, 167; Clergy, 167; Confirmees, 169; Sunday Schools, 172; Day Schools, 171; Home and Foreign Missions, 169; Church Building, 168-169; Hospital Sunday, 143; Benefactions to Ecclesiastical Commission, 141.
Roman Catholics, The, 176.
Society for Propagation of the Gospel, 169.
Sumner v. *Wix*, 175.
Stanley, Dean, on Disestablishment, 147.
Stannard Case, 144.
St. Alban's, Holborn, 102, 199.
St. Peter's, London Docks, 15, 197.
Stevens, Bishop, quoted, 30, 161.
Stillingfleet, Bishop, quoted, 40, 199.
Strype's *Annals*, 157.

TABLET, The, quoted, 5, 177.
Tait, Archbishop, quoted, 25, 75,
Taylor, Bp. J., quoted, 6, 25, 75, 130, 132.
Tertullian, quoted, 34.
Thirlwall, Bishop, quoted, xvii., 5, 188, 190, 193, 200.
Theodore, Archbishop, 38.
Thomson, Archbishop, quoted, 6, 146, 168, 203.
Tithes, Origin of, 140.
Tracts for the Times, 14, 130.
Treasury of Devotion, 119.
Trent, Canons of, compared with the Thirty-nine Articles, 43, 45.
Trent, Canons of, on Baptism, 82; Confession, 117; the Lord's Supper, 96; the Sacraments, 75.
Treves, "holy coat" of, 179.
Truth, Counterfeits of, 187.
Tyndale's New Testament, 153.

UNBELIEF, prevalent, 2, 188.
"Uses" of Sarum, York, etc., 152.
Unitarians, The, 182.

VAUGHAN, Dean, quoted, 26, 90, 92, 113, 128, 160.
Vincentius of Lirinium, 199.

WARBURTON, Bishop, on Church and State, 138.
Waterland, Bishop, on the Real Presence, 110.
Watkins, Professor, quoted, 86.
Weekly Register, quoted, 5.
Wesley John, 183.
Wesleyan Methodists, 184.
Westminster Gazette, quoted, 188.
Westerton v. Liddell, 113.
Westcott, Bp., on the Christian Ministry, 66; the Creeds, 162; Regeneration, 86; the Real Presence, 109.
Whately, Archbishop, xi., 3; on Apostolical Succession, 55, 56; Priesthood, 192.
Whitaker, Dr., quoted, 75.
Wilberforce, Bishop S., quoted, 5, 6, 39; on Confession, 129.
Wordsworth, Bishop Chr., on Heb. xiii. 10, 111; the Church, 26; the Early British Church, 36; Protestantism, 42*b*; the Sacraments, 76; Incense, 76; Prayer for the Dead, 134; Ritualism, 13.
Wyclif, John, 39.
Wyclif's Bible, 153.

YEAR BOOK OF THE CHURCH, 141, 143, 166-168.
York, Church Extension in diocese of, 168.

BEMROSE AND SONS, PRINTERS, DERBY AND LONDON.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM ODOM.

Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Crown 8vo. Neat Cloth, 2/6.

The Church of England: Her Principles, Ministry, and Sacraments.

A COMPREHENSIVE HAND-BOOK FOR CHURCHMEN.

Notices of the First and Second Editions.

DR. PEROWNE (Bishop of Worcester).—"It is just what was wanted—a concise and popular manual dealing with all the main points at issue; fair, comprehensive, and true."

THE CHURCHMAN.—"We hardly know any other Manual of this kind so full and so cheap."

THE RECORD.—"This is a sound, accurate, and carefully compiled Manual."

THE ROCK.—"The Author has performed his task with conspicuous care, ability, and judgment."

THE MANCHESTER COURIER.—"It is written in a calm, thoughtful, and Christianlike spirit. We give our hearty commendation to the book, which is one of the clearest and most comprehensive on the question we remember to have seen."

THE CLERGYMAN'S MAGAZINE.—"It deserves extensive recognition. Those who want an accurate definition of the Holy Catholic Church will find it here. Each one of the principal subjects of contention within our Church is ably discussed."

IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL GAZETTE.—"The most able exposition put forth by the Evangelical party in England."

PUBLISHERS' CIRCULAR.—"It fully achieves its purpose as a guide to sound and definite Church teaching."

FOURTH THOUSAND. Crown 8vo. Neat Cloth, 1s.

Gospel Types & Shadows of the Old Testament.

This Work comprises an Introduction, Table of Messianic Prophecies, and Fifty-two Short Studies on the Typical Persons, Places, and Things of the Old Testament, and is a convenient Handbook to the Typology of Scripture.

DR. WORDSWORTH, Bishop of Lincoln.—"Your excellent work, 'Gospel Types and Shadows,' will be of much use in unfolding the spiritual sense of the Divine Word."

CHURCH BELLS.—"We gave this excellent little volume a cordial welcome on its first appearance, and we are now glad to find a second edition has so soon been called for."

SHEFFIELD DAILY TELEGRAPH.—"A most admirable work, which cannot fail to be useful, not only to Sunday school teachers, but for Bible students generally."

MR. SPURGEON (in the **SWORD AND TROWEL**).—"Very good indeed. The expenditure will break no one . . . We commend the investment to those who have few books and little time."

METHODIST TIMES.—"Preachers and Teachers will do well to get it."

London: Nisbet & Co.; Sheffield: T. Widdison, Fargate; & all Booksellers.

DATE DUE

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY